

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

R. R. 3



JUL 20 1957

Bulletin

Vol. XXXVII, No. 943

July 22, 1957

THE DURABILITY OF THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY ● <i>by Under Secretary Herter</i>	135
SECRETARY DULLES' NEWS CONFERENCE OF JULY 2	139
SUPPLEMENTAL TRADE AGREEMENT WITH CUBA ● <i>White House and Department Announcements and Texts of Agreement and Proclamation</i>	157
EVALUATION OF REPORT ON WORLD SOCIAL SITUATION ● <i>Statement by Althea K. Hottel</i>	166
INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN REPORTING WEATHER OBSERVATIONS FROM THE HIGH SEAS ● <i>Article by W. F. McDonald</i>	164

For index see inside back cover

THE
OFFICIAL
WEEKLY RECORD
OF
THE UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF
FOREIGN POLICY

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Bulletin

VOL. XXXVII, No. 943 • PUBLICATION 6522

July 22, 1957

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Public Services Division, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$7.50, foreign \$10.25
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 19, 1955).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

The Durability of the Atlantic Community

by Under Secretary Herter¹

I was asked to speak to you here this morning on a question for which in reality you have to provide the answers. If anyone in the countries of the Atlantic Community wants to explore the durability of the Community, his questions should be directed to you, for the answers must necessarily be the result of your studies. They must be the synthesis of all the factors which you have considered here these past 2 weeks: the political structure, the economic cooperation, the military strategy, and the social and cultural interrelationship.

It remains for me, therefore, to try to point out how the United States sees these factors and their relationship to each other, to point to the weaknesses as well as the strengths of this Community, and to portray to you the guideposts which as a result of these strengths and weaknesses are used in the formulation of U.S. policy. I trust that our view of these factors will not be too different from those which have already entered your deliberation so that our conclusions may be based substantially on the same assumptions.

The M-Factor

To begin this examination of the durability of the Atlantic Community, I should like to borrow a device developed by scientists and exploited by advertising men: I will try to demonstrate the strength of the M-factor. "M" stands for mutuality of interest, for the things we have in common, for those facts in the lives of our nations that make us a community.

What makes up this M-factor? There is, first

of all, the common cultural heritage that underlies all our nations. We have grown out of the Greco-Roman culture. We have adopted the belief in certain basic moral principles embodied in our Holy Scriptures—be they Christian, Jewish, or Islamic—and these principles have continued through the decline and fall of empires, through the Dark Ages, the Renaissance, the Reformation, the Industrial Revolution, and even in face of the advent of "modern thought." They bind us more than any other fact because they are based on one basic belief: the dignity of the individual. In this belief all other areas of mutuality are rooted.

In the second place, we have developed essentially similar economic systems. The methods are, of course, not identical. But each system is designed to insure the welfare of the individual and not the aggrandizement of the state and to assure that the individual shall have a just share of the product of his labors.

Third, our system of education, our methods of social care for our citizens, our appreciation of the value of the hours of leisure, all stem from this basic recognition of the dignity of the individual—the M-factor of the Atlantic Community.

Let me say here parenthetically that there are many other countries, not part of the community of which we now speak, which recognize the same values. I do not exclude them in any way. They merely lack one attribute that excludes them from this discussion: their geographic location. Nor do I wish to exclude the peoples of Eastern Europe. Truly they are very closely akin, too, with the same traditions and aspirations as any of us. But the governments imposed on them currently deny those traditions and, more im-

¹Address made before the Princeton University conference on NATO at Princeton, N. J., on June 29 (press release 398 dated June 28).

portantly, deny to the people these very rights of individual dignity.

Against these traditions of our Community there stand the forces that seek to undermine and destroy it: the forces of the totalitarian state as embodied in the threat of the Soviet Union. This threat, as I need not remind you, is twofold: the threat of an ideology, Leninism-Stalinism (and, if you like, Khrushchevism), which rejects the rights of the individual and substitutes the allegedly higher interest of the all-powerful state, and, secondly, the threat of a regime with imperialistic ambitions seeking to dominate the world. This combination makes the current threat to our Community all the more sobering, for it would subvert the foundations on which our society rests. Under such alien rule our basic political system, based on the rule of law, would disappear. Our economic system would no longer benefit the individual. Our system of education would no longer be able to bring to light the maximum capabilities of our young people but would be designed solely to assure that the needs of the state are met. Surely, in the long run, our culture itself would disappear.

Unity of Purpose

Is it any wonder then that, in the face of so massive a threat, we have sought that method of meeting it which peoples have used since time immemorial: unity? The unity which has grown among the peoples of the Atlantic Community since 1945 far surpasses any previously established. You have studied the institutional manifestations of that unity: the Western European Union, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the Coal and Steel Community, the agreement for a European Atomic Community, a Common Market and the proposed free trade area, as well as the one institution that stretches across the Atlantic, NATO. You are familiar with their origins, their aims, their methods, their achievements and shortcomings.

Some institutions are more successful than others. But I believe that the underlying decision for unity, spurred by the threat of a loss of all we hold sacred, is greater than these institutions and organizations. If there had been no WEU, no OEEC, or no NATO, there would have been other groupings seeking to achieve the same goal. Surely NATO, when it was created,

was no *deus ex machina* to save us from all our troubles; it was the result of the deliberations of a group of farsighted leaders who met to give expression to the unity of purpose which all of us felt at that time. The authors of the recently issued report of the Committee of Three on Non-Military Co-operation² gave clear expression to this when they wrote:

There was a feeling among the governments and peoples concerned, that this closer unity was both natural and desirable; that the common cultural traditions, free institutions and democratic concepts which were being challenged, and were marked for destruction by those who challenged them, were things which should also bring the NATO nations closer together, not only for their defence but for their development. There was, in short, a sense of Atlantic Community, alongside the realization of an immediate common danger.

This is the thought which I hope will be the surest basis of your report: that the question of the desirability of a durable Atlantic Community no longer needs to be answered; it is already an incontrovertible fact of life among us. Some of you may criticize one or another of the institutions which have resulted—NATO is no more immune to that than any of the others—but no political sentiment other than the Communist has in the postwar period challenged the unity of purpose underlying the Atlantic Community itself.

If this is the case, must we not ask ourselves if the Community will continue to have this strength? What of this question of durability?

To my mind, this question can only be answered by an examination of the forces which might destroy the unity we have already achieved. At the outset we should clearly recognize that the principal danger to this unity would be the failure to appreciate that there exists a community interest that transcends the individual interests of its members.

Specifically, however, it seems to me that there are essentially three factors which might weaken the Community: first, differences in the appraisal of the threat which faces us; secondly, differences in the steps needed to cope with that threat; and thirdly, differences in policy on problems in other areas of such magnitude as to affect our ability to work together.

There is now no difference among the NATO nations as regards the basic reality of the threat

² BULLETIN of Jan. 7, 1957, p. 18.

which faces us. Not all of the NATO partners have been in entire agreement as to the nature and immediacy of the threat. For a while, last spring and summer, the Soviet facade of smiles seemed to some to be the expression of a true change of heart. Some of us nearly let our wishes, rather than our experience, guide us. But the Soviet rulers themselves decided to show us their true face: The ruthless murder of thousands of Hungarians brought us back to reality.

If, then, we know the danger, we must seek to make certain that we have found a mutually agreed method of dealing with it.

NATO's Sword and Shield

Our military strategists, guided by our civilian representatives, have developed our first line of defense: a collective security system based on NATO's sword and shield. I call the latter two our first line of defense because they are as inseparable as two sides of a coin. Because we believe that man must be productive beyond his service in the armed forces, the democratic nations of the Atlantic Community cannot raise a force in peacetime of sufficient size to meet the Red Army's 175 divisions, man for man. We have therefore found it necessary to rely, *in part*, on the possession of atomic capabilities in our NATO strategy. The primary purpose of this strategy is *deterrence*. Our forces in Europe—the shield—are part of this deterrent and also are an earnest of our intent to stand and protect NATO territory in event of attack. In addition, they would enable our nuclear power to become operative in time. The strategic air force—the sword—represents the main aspect of the deterrent. In the event of attack, it would also enable us to retaliate effectively against the sources of enemy military power. As clear as this policy is, it is a policy that has brought great hardships to many of us. It requires of this country not only a budget sufficiently large to maintain and perfect the air arm but one which can also support our present five divisions in Europe, naval forces strong enough to protect the connecting sea lanes, and additional military aid to our allies.

It requires others to make equal budgetary sacrifices. Recently the United Kingdom announced that it felt the necessity to reduce some of its troops on the Continent. We were concerned by this decision but heartened by the agreement of

Her Majesty's Government to phase this withdrawal over a period long enough to give Germany additional time to build up her forces. That buildup, while long in getting under way, is now moving forward, and we hope that the German Government will be able to reach the goals it has set, both in time and strength.

This military strategy requires some NATO soldiers to serve on foreign soil, far from their families and friends. It requires civilian populations to deal patiently and understandingly with the problems which the garrisoning of foreign troops inevitably provokes. It requires the availability of the most modern weapons to those troops for use in protecting those civilians. It requires that fertile farms be turned into air fields, mountain tops into radar stations, and civilians into soldiers, sailors, and airmen. Yet, considering the threat, is the price too dear? Can we shortchange our security, our freedom, ourselves? I say that in our doubts over the methods of meeting the threat, in our hesitancy over the need to make one further sacrifice, we must not lose sight of the reasons for this policy or of the danger we face.

The other danger to our unity comes from divergence of basic policies. No matter how clearly we see the threat to our own future, our cohesiveness could be sorely impaired unless there is mutual understanding on such problems as disarmament, the future of the underdeveloped world, and the more distant goals of our society. In keeping with the report of the Committee of Three, which I quoted earlier, we must recognize that the influence and interest of the NATO members are not confined to the area covered by the treaty. We therefore acknowledge the need for consultation among the members regarding policies in other areas.

Last fall, the crisis in the Middle East badly disturbed the unity of the Western World. In spite of the differences which arose, there was never any danger that the Atlantic Community would not continue. Since the Suez crisis, we have gone a long way toward repairing the unity of the alliance, and there is a greater measure of agreement on policies for furthering the political and economic interests and the security of the area. As you know, we are currently engaged in an effort to develop with continuing consultation a policy of disarmament which we hope might

bring us at least some small step closer to the end of the arms race in which we are engaged. These are examples of the type of action, labeled "political consultation" by the NATO Wise Men, which are designed to bring about greater strength in the Community by permitting all the members to participate in the development of all major policies. By these means, the danger of disunity can be considerably reduced; it would be foolish to assume that among free nations differences of approach can ever be completely eliminated.

I believe that it has now become quite clear that the concept of the Atlantic Community will be able to withstand the removal of the direct threat or any other changes in policy. It has become part of the basic strength of the free world which is necessary not only to meet an imminent danger but also as a force in changing the future relationship between nations.

The Future of the Community

Having examined the common characteristics of the Community, the threats from outside which have caused its members to draw closer together, and the stresses within it which might impair its unity were it not for the active efforts of its members to hold it together, it remains for me to discuss with you the policy of my Government with respect to the future of the Community.

Let me first of all remind you that this country's ties to Europe are such that Europe naturally occupies a predominant place in the minds and hearts of most Americans. We speak a European tongue. The majority of our peoples had their ancestral homes there. Most of our trade, most of our foreign travel, is with the European countries of the Atlantic Community. Add to this the fact that the American people have elected and reelected a President whose reputation was directly linked with a European alliance and whose personal feeling on the need to maintain this alliance is exceedingly strong. In his second inaugural address,³ President Eisenhower stated

³ *Ibid.*, Feb. 11, 1957, p. 211.

his views on the interdependence of nations as follows:

No people can live to itself alone. The unity of all who dwell in freedom is their only sure defense. The economic need of all nations, in mutual dependence, makes isolation an impossibility; not even America's prosperity could long survive if other nations did not also prosper. No nation can longer be a fortress, lone and strong and safe. And any people seeking such shelter for themselves can now build only their prison.

It is this policy which guides our relationship with Europe today.

In spite of all of this it must be recognized that this country has responsibilities, embodied in solemn treaty obligations, on a worldwide scale. We have collective security arrangements with 42 nations, and we shall honor our obligations with the non-European nations, should this ever become necessary, as quickly and thoroughly as we would honor those with Europe. There can be no first-class and second-class alliances any more than the freedom of an individual in Korea could be considered to be worth less than that of an individual in France or Germany.

We are determined, then, to seek ways and means, together with our allies, of safeguarding the basic M-factor: the dignity and freedom of the individual. We recognize the magnitude of the task, the great responsibilities that fall on us because we have suddenly been thrust into a position of world leadership. Americans did not seek and do not relish that role. We are determined not to carry it alone. All the nations of the Atlantic Community, where democracy was born and where it has flourished, must continue to exercise initiative and to cooperate closely in the common interest as they have in the past if NATO is to live and thrive.

I would like to close on a note of faith; the durability of the NATO concept has already survived grave tests in which apathy and cost and a false sense of security have all figured. In surviving, it has gained new vitality. I believe that this great partnership of free men will continue to grow in depth and in strength.

Secretary Dulles' News Conference of July 2

Press release 405 dated July 2

Secretary Dulles: I am ready for questions.

Q. Mr. Secretary, in your San Francisco speech on the China policy,¹ if I read it correctly, your position seemed to be based on the premise which you stated in these words, "International communism's rule of strict conformity is, in China as elsewhere, a passing and not a perpetual phase." Can you spell out a little bit what you mean by that? Do you mean communism itself in China is a passing phase, or this type of communism?

A. I meant primarily the type of communism that is now reflected by what we call international communism. I do not think that it is by any means safe to predict that in every country in the world there may not be some form of socialism, because Communist regimes practice what they call socialism, really. They do not claim in Russia to practice communism; they practice socialism. They say the time for communism has not arrived yet as a practicing doctrine. One cannot predict for all the world that there may not be different forms of socialism. But I do believe that the type of rule which is reflected by the doctrine of strict conformity and the elimination of any difference of opinion—and that does not necessarily go with socialism or communism and it may go with a type of Fascist dictatorship equally—I do not believe that that kind of government or regime will anywhere prevail in the long run.

Q. Mr. Secretary, is it your belief, then, that the Peiping regime acts in strict conformity with Moscow today?

A. When I talk about strict conformity, I am talking about a regime which requires strict conformity on the part of those who are subject to it.

Q. You are talking of political rather than economic terms—internally?

A. I am talking about a regime which tries to control the thoughts and the beliefs of people so as to make them into a single pattern. I do not think that is practical, given, as I said, the nature of human beings.

Q. Well, do you feel, sir, that Mao Tse-tung's speech, or other information that has been coming out of China lately, indicates some change, or signs of changes, in this respect?

A. I think I said last week² that one could not yet judge whether Mao Tse-tung's speech about the hundred flowers was something which represented a beginning of liberalism or was a method of entrapment. Since then it is, I think, quite apparent that it was a method of entrapment. An article in the Peiping *People's Daily*, I think it is, that I was told about this morning—I put it in my pocket here—said, "Only by letting the poisonous weeds"—they are now called poisonous weeds and not flowers (Laughter)—"Only by letting the poisonous weeds show themselves above ground can they be uprooted. The reactionary class enemies have enmeshed themselves in the trap that was spread for them."

Q. Mr. Secretary, to go back to this, in relation to your speech, is it correct to assume, then, that your position, the Government's position, will remain unchanged until there is some liberalization, if that comes, politically within China, and that you do not exclude the possibility of that coming under what is called the Communist regime, although you do not now see that?

A. Our Government's dealing with other governments depends primarily upon their conduct in the realm of foreign affairs. While we have our own beliefs and our own faiths with respect to the treatment of human beings, the nature of human beings and their right to freedom of speech

¹ BULLETIN of July 15, 1957, p. 91.

² *Ibid.*, July 15, 1957, p. 101.

and expression, and so forth, we do not primarily base our foreign relations upon that but rather upon how these nations conduct themselves in the sphere of foreign affairs. I would say that, if any regime conducts itself respectably in the field of foreign affairs, then our attitude would be responsive to that. It would be without regard, necessarily, to their own domestic policies. So long as their domestic policies are wholly domestic, we do not take them into account in deciding how we deal with them in the realm of international affairs.

Q. Well, Mr. Secretary, your speech on Friday and your expansion on it this morning invite possibly another inference, and I wonder if you would clarify it. What you might call the classic American posture toward communism, both from the standpoint of our Government policy and our public thinking, is that it has been one international conspiracy, that it is always part of a whole, operated from Moscow, and that this was the beginning and the end of communism. Are you saying by what you said in the speech, and particularly by your last answer, that that is no longer likely, that it isn't a global conspiracy but it is becoming little constellations of communism and socialism in various countries?

A. No, I didn't intend to infer that. What I did mean to infer was that it is possible to have—for example, in Yugoslavia—a government which is communistic but which is not, in our judgment, part and parcel of what we call the international Communist conspiracy. As far as we can judge, the nations which are within the Sino-Soviet bloc are all dominated by what can fairly be called international communism, a single group which provides a guiding force. Now one does seem to detect at times differences between the Chinese ideology and the Soviet ideology, and President Tito indicated he thought there was a difference and that the Chinese ideology was tending more to a nationalistic form. However, I would not think that our estimate conformed to President Tito's in that respect.

Q. Mr. Secretary, could you tell us why you chose this particular time and that particular forum for so extensive a discussion of the China issue?

A. There has been no formal presentation of the administration's viewpoint on that subject for

several years, and the President and I thought it was appropriate that there should be such a statement, because there seemed to be in some quarters the implication that silence on the subject indicated that our basic views were changing, which was not, in fact, the case.

Q. Mr. Secretary, do you find that our allies accept the American point of view relative to China without a single quibble?

A. Without quibble?

Q. Yes. Do they accept it as the United States presents it?

A. Some of our allies agree with it and some of them don't.

Q. To what degree can disagreement on the part of our allies be negatory of our own policies?

A. Well, it can obviously mean that our policy is not as effective as though everybody were in accord with it. Of course, as we know, the United Kingdom recognized the Chinese Communist regime rather promptly some 5 or 6 [7] years ago. I don't know whether that has had any particular effect on the situation, because actually very little in the way of diplomatic intercourse has come out of it. But naturally, in our opinion, it would be better if everybody agreed with us.

Disarmament

Q. Mr. Secretary, how do you equate your policies with the present disarmament conference going on? Can you have disarmament without including Red China?

A. Yes, I think one can have a disarmament agreement without including Red China. Of course, if it were not possible to have it without including Red China, then it might be possible to have undertakings from Red China. We already have such undertakings in the form of agreements to limit armament and agreements for inspection, in relation to both North Korea and Viet-Nam, and that does not involve any diplomatic recognition.

Q. Those are military arrangements, Mr. Secretary. What would be the consideration in the case of stoppage of nuclear production within an agreement by countries which are not nuclear powers to avoid obtaining nuclear weapons if Red China was not included? Would the assumption

of the United States be that Red China would voluntarily abide by such an agreement?

A. Our assumption, I think, would be that it is extremely unlikely that the Chinese Communist regime would get assistance in that area from the Soviet Union, and, indeed, the provisions of the disarmament agreement would probably preclude that. Of course, that doesn't of itself mean that they would be lived up to, but probably evasions of that sort—violations of that sort—would become known, and if they became known, if they happened and became known, then that would be an occasion for calling off the whole agreement. It is quite possible, you see, to have an agreement which stands on certain presuppositions. Some of those presuppositions might relate to Communist China without it being a party to the agreement. Then if those presuppositions proved unfounded, the agreement would be called off. It might very well be that pressure of that sort, particularly from the Soviet Union, if it wanted the agreements to continue in force, would have the result that the Chinese Communists would, in fact, conform without being a party to the agreement.

Q. Mr. Secretary, is it your view that the Chinese Communists unaided cannot produce atomic-hydrogen weapons? Is that correct?

A. I doubt very much whether they would go into that production on their own. I don't say that it could not be done, but it would be a very expensive operation. It would be an operation which probably could not be done without detection, and, as I say, the terms of our arrangement could be such, probably would be such, that, if it was found that that was going on, then our restraints could be shed.

Q. Mr. Secretary, is it not our assumption that in a cutoff production agreement there would be an effective inspection system in the three present nuclear powers and that for other countries the peaceful agencies would amount to an inspection system to prevent the development of weapons? If that is correct, then we would have, if this worked out, an inspection system for all the countries of the world, with the exception of the Chinese Communists and those European satellites that we don't recognize. Is that sufficient? Do we consider that sufficiently adequate?

A. I think we believe that a system can be

devised, without necessarily the Chinese Communist regime being a contractual party to it, which would state certain terms and conditions, and certain presuppositions, certain assumptions as regards countries which were not parties. And, of course, it is not only Communist China which may not be a party, but there are probably quite a few other countries that won't be parties. We can't make an agreement here which is contingent upon every nation of the world being a party to it. And you can say that to that extent there is always a risk that somebody might engage in this business of making atomic weapons. But the arrangement would have to be of such character that in the first place that probably could be detected, which I think can be made the case even without contractual arrangements for inspection, and also that, if that happened, then the limitations which other countries had assumed could, if they desired, be shed.

Q. Mr. Secretary, I don't believe you mentioned the question of newsmen in Red China in your San Francisco address? Was this an oversight, or does it perhaps mean that there is something coming which is around the corner on this issue?

A. When you talk about "just around the corner," it makes me think back in the days of the depression, you remember, where the end of the depression was "just around the corner." (Laughter) No, I deliberately did not attempt to deal with that problem, and I don't think that anything that I said forecloses treatment of it as a special matter, if that seems appropriate, and I am still studying that matter.

Aid to Jordan

Q. Mr. Secretary, is any of the economic aid being given to Jordan³ to be used for the River Jordan project?

A. I don't think I can answer the question as to whether it could be used for it. I doubt that it will be because I think that the occasion for the financial assistance, economic and military, is needs which are more urgent and more pressing than that water project, so that whether or not the economic funds could be used directly or indirectly for that purpose, I don't know. I think that it is unlikely that they will be.

Q. Mr. Secretary, does the administration in-

³ See p. 146.

tend at any time in the near future a revival of the Johnston plan for the economic development of the Middle East, for the Jordan River Valley project?

A. Well, we would, of course, like to see a revival of a plan for putting the waters of the Jordan to use both in Israel and in Jordan. Whether or not the time is ripe for that yet, I don't know. In some respects conditions seem to be ameliorating, and we would hope that constructive developments could take place. There is no concrete plan that I am aware of for further negotiation about that at the moment. In other words, no concrete plans are in process.

Q. Mr. Secretary, on the question of Jordan, within the past 6 weeks or so we have made available to King Hussein's government a total of \$30 million in economic and military aid. Now this amount is almost exactly the amount that Britain used to give to Jordan in the way of an annual subsidy for a variety of purposes. Does it follow from the fact that we have given \$30 million to Jordan that we intend or have some thought of replacing or succeeding Britain as a main financial source for Jordan?

A. There are no inferences of that sort that should be drawn from the fact that those sums do approximately coincide. We would hope that Jordan would be able to get an increased measure of financial assistance from Arab neighbors, and of course we also hope that the Jordanian economy will improve to a point where it can more nearly meet the expenses of its own government. There had been, as you know, assurances given to Jordan by Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Syria. Egypt and Syria have defaulted on their undertakings to Jordan, and it was primarily that fact which led the United States to move into the breach. In other words, I would say we were moving into the breach created by the default of Egypt and Syria rather than moving into the position that the United Kingdom had had.

Q. But do we have future plans for continued aid to Jordan, sir?

A. No, there are no such plans. That does not exclude the possibility that we might give some future aid, but there is no commitment.

Q. Mr. Secretary, can you say what the pros-

pects are for an international conference on unification of Korea?

A. Well, I don't think that the prospects are good, because there is no indication at all yet that the puppet regime there or the Chinese Communists will accept the terms which have been laid down by the United Nations and which were endorsed by the group which met at the Korean conference at Geneva in 1954, to the effect that there should be elections under the auspices of the United Nations.⁴ You will recall that the Government of South Korea resulted from elections held under the auspices of the United Nations, and the United Nations had intended that those elections should be held in all of Korea. The representatives of the United Nations were denied admission to North Korea, so that such elections could not be held. The United Nations believes, and the representatives of those of the free nations that met at Geneva have adhered to the view, that the basis for the reunification of Korea is to have free elections there under the auspices of the United Nations. At any time that those in control of North Korea will admit of that fact, then there could be the reunification of Korea. But they have never been willing to meet that test and have demanded, as a condition for unification, terms which would in fact afford an opportunity for the minority Communist regime of North Korea to penetrate into South Korea and have a good chance of overthrowing the government through subversive activities. That we do not accept.

Algeria

Q. Mr. Secretary, a couple of Senators plan to push for a resolution in the Senate which would ask the administration to move to an attempt to get for Algeria independent personality either through NATO or working through Morocco and Tunisia. Are you aware of those plans, and if so, can you tell us how you would feel about a Senate resolution urging that kind of action?

A. Well, I had heard that there might be a proposal of that sort made, perhaps today. I do not know of it in detail. I would, however, say this: I think that there is no doubt, should be no doubt, in any quarter that the United States is very mindful of its own colonial origins and that

⁴ BULLETIN of June 28, 1954, p. 973.

it is very sympathetic to the aspirations of people to have a government of their own choosing. On the other hand, it must, I think, be recognized that the problem of Algeria is one of exceptional difficulty and of complications because of the fact that there is present there a very large European element—about a million and a half people, as I recall—and that the people of Algeria themselves are very largely divided and it is difficult to find responsible persons to deal with who are adequately representative of all the people.

When one tries to judge the conduct of France, I think it must be recalled that France has a record of having completed the independence of five nations within the last 3 or 4 years—Viet-Nam, Laos, Cambodia, Tunisia, and Morocco—and therefore I do not think it can fairly be assumed that the French are reactionary in these matters.

I think also it needs to be considered as to whether the United States can be helpful through overt interposition into this situation or by making it known, as it is known, that its help and assistance is always available when desired. We have, perhaps, been slightly helpful with respect to the five cases that I have spoken of, or certainly some of them. And our position in that respect is well known, and I am inclined to think that we can be more helpful that way than by trying ourselves to assume the responsibility for the solution of that extremely difficult problem, which is not primarily ours, I am thankful to say. And I would be very sorry to see it made ours, because of the great difficulty and complexity of the problem.

I also believe, if anyone is interested in going after colonialism, there are a lot better places to go after it than the case of France in Algeria. There is a lot of colonialism in the world—Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, East Germany, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and I could go on with a long list. And if one is really interested in going after the most evil manifestations of colonialism, the denial to people of the opportunity to have governments of their own choosing, one could perhaps find a better place to start than Algeria.

Q. I judge then that you don't think a Senate resolution to this effect would be very helpful. (Laughter)

A. I have not seen the resolution. Perhaps, if

you have seen it, you can apply to it the criteria that I have suggested.

Q. Mr. Secretary, do you think that Chancellor Adenauer's acceptance of including West Germany in the European inspection zone will make the establishment of such a zone more likely and easier, inasmuch as this would solve one of the political problems in establishing the zone which you have talked about earlier?

A. I have not seen the text of what Chancellor Adenauer said. As I have said myself here several times, it is the view of the United States that the problem of an inspection zone in Europe is primarily a problem to be dealt with by the continental countries themselves. They are dealing with it very actively, both in talks which these countries are having directly with the four powers—the four Western Powers—in London and also through the meetings of NATO. I think that there is no objection in principle, that I am aware of, on the part of these countries to such a zone, and the report from Chancellor Adenauer seems to confirm that, as far as the Federal Republic is concerned. But there are of course very great difficulties in practice, and whether or not those are solvable I don't know.

Evolutionary Change

Q. Mr. Secretary, it is undoubtedly due to my own density, but I am still confused as to the projection of your comment about the passing phase of communism in China. Does it presuppose some kind of invasion such as you speculated about and about which Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek still actively speculates? Does it presuppose, instead of that, some kind of uprising on the mainland of China, or a change in the regime in China more toward the Tito-like regime, or what?

A. What it presupposes is this, that we accept, as a working hypothesis, the view that that type of despotism will never prevail and that the kind of a government which is responsive to the will of the people, which admits of diversity and freedom of thought and expression, is the government which has the future ahead of it.

Now that, as I say, is a working hypothesis that we assume. It underlies all our actions, all our conduct in these matters. I say it's a working hypothesis, but I don't know how it's going to work out. These matters work out in an infinite variety

of ways. All that I mean is that we do not assume that that type of despotism represents the wave of the future in China or anywhere else. American policy is conducted on the assumption, as a working hypothesis, that free governments in the long run are going to prevail and despotic governments in the long run are going to go under.

Q. Mr. Secretary, do you apply the same working hypothesis to the Soviet Union?

A. Yes. We believe that it is almost certain that there will be an evolutionary change—probably evolutionary. Conceivably it could be revolutionary, but it does not seem likely. And indeed, already there is a trend in the Soviet Union to somewhat greater personal freedom, somewhat greater freedom of expression, somewhat greater enjoyment by people of the fruits of their labor.

One can see evidence of that already. And I believe that that kind of trend is going to prevail, and I think that the United States should accept, as I say, as a working hypothesis underlying its policies, the assumption that that kind of trend is going to prevail. I don't put any dates on these things. I don't say what is going to happen in 1 year, 5 years, 10 years, but I am confident that that is a basic truth. Certainly it's an assumption that I think must be made by anybody who believes in the American tradition. It was in that belief that our Nation was founded. It's expressed in *The Federalist* papers. It is expressed by Abraham Lincoln in a sentence I often quote. He said our Declaration of Independence meant liberty not alone for the people of this country but hope for all the world for all future time. It means in due course the weight should be lifted from the shoulders of all men. That is a basic American belief, and it is also the working hypothesis on which we conduct our foreign policy.

Q. Mr. Secretary, you mean Khrushchev's grandchildren will be free, then?

A. Well, I didn't put a date on this, but I will say this, if he goes on having children and they have children's children, his posterity will be free.

Q. Mr. Secretary, in the case of Russia, you said it was probably more likely that this change would be evolutionary. Now, you haven't expressed any view as to whether you thought this change in Communist China more likely would be evolutionary or revolutionary. Could you express some view on that?

A. There are more revolutionary elements present in China at the present time than seem to be present within the Soviet Union, but I wouldn't want that to be interpreted as a prediction that there was going to be a revolution in China. I don't know how it is going to work out.

Q. Mr. Secretary, a week ago the Dominican Government handed a note to our Embassy in Ciudad Trujillo extensively replying to our request that Generalissimo Trujillo waive immunity to judicial procedure here in connection with the Murphy-Galindez case.⁵ Could you tell us what the contents of that note said, what our attitude is now?

A. Well, my recollection is that the note said, in effect, that it would not be appropriate to have a cabinet officer leave Santo Domingo to come to another country for the purposes of judicial inquiries there. And I believe that the situation is being studied to see what, in the light of that, we can appropriately do.

Tests for Recognition

Q. Mr. Secretary, in your discussion about Communist China you talked about this assumption of some kind of change. But at an earlier stage, in answering a question, you spoke about the measure of recognition being the respectability of the conduct of a power. Is there an implication in the relationship of those two ideas that U.S. recognition or attitude on recognition toward Communist China is not determined entirely or primarily by whether this change internally comes about? And if that is true, what are the measurements of respectability which would be applied?

A. It is true, as I said, that, when it comes to having diplomatic and official relations with a regime, we do not make as a primary test how it conducts itself at home but rather how it conducts itself in the international field. And it is only on that basis that we have diplomatic relations with many countries with which we now have such relations.

Now, as regards the tests, I think you can find those are indicated in the speech which I made. I indicated there a number of historic tests that have been made. The treatment of American citizens is one test to which we attach very great importance and which always has been treated as

⁵ For background, see *ibid.*, June 24, 1957, p. 1025.

a matter of great importance. The willingness and ability to live up to its international obligations, the disposition of a regime to live peacefully and abstain from international acts of aggression—those are all elements which are weighed in the scales, and I think you will find all those suggested or dealt with in my speech.

Q. Mr. Secretary, the President said at a recent press conference that he didn't feel nearly as strongly as some other people about the value of a total trade embargo against Red China. Were the various interpretations of this statement one of the factors that led you and the President to decide that a new statement on this subject was advisable at this time? And also, how do you reconcile that statement, his statement, that is, with the policy of the administration?

A. That reference that you speak of to the President's press conference was not the occasion for this speech. And I might say, which I think can always be assumed in a speech of that character, that it was thoroughly approved by the President before I made it.

Q. Mr. Secretary, what is your concept of our future in Okinawa?

A. As was said at the Japanese peace conference, the residual sovereignty in Okinawa rests with Japan. And we are there primarily in the interest of peace and security in the area. And that is not merely a matter which concerns the United States, but it also concerns other countries that were parties to that treaty. Of course, Japan itself has an interest, but other countries also.

As I pointed out at San Francisco when I expounded the peace treaty, there were quite a few of our Allies that wanted the United States to annex Okinawa outright so that the American flag would surely wave forever at that point. They wanted to see it planted there without the possibility of any change. I explained that in the face of that opinion and of the other opinions, however, we had decided that the best solution was to leave the residual sovereignty in Japan but to give the United States the rights of control and administration for as long as it felt it was appropriate. That, in turn, I can say, is directly connected with the judgment that we have as to how long that is useful to serve the interests of peace and security in the area.

Q. Thank you, sir.

Beginning of the International Geophysical Year

Remarks by President Eisenhower¹

July 1st marks the beginning of one of the great scientific adventures of our time—the International Geophysical Year. During this period, which will actually be 18 months long, the scientists of the United States will join their efforts with those of the scientists of some 60 other nations to make the most intensive study ever undertaken of our planet.²

All over the world elaborate preparations for this event have been under way for the last 5 years. You have been reading in the daily press of the expeditions to the Antarctic which have been paving the way for a concentrated study by some 12 nations of the last unknown continent. Two years ago it was announced that the United States would launch an earth-circling satellite during the International Geophysical Year in order to obtain information about the sun and the earth's environment from outside the barrier of the earth's atmosphere. During the years of preparation meteorological and other observing stations all over the globe have been readied. Hundreds of new stations have been established in order that many types of geophysical phenomena might be viewed and measured from every possible vantage point.

The scientists tell us that they cannot possibly anticipate all of the valuable scientific knowledge that will result from their efforts. They believe that many of the facts thus acquired will give us new understanding and new power over the forces of nature.

As I see it, however, the most important result of the International Geophysical Year is the demonstration of the ability of peoples of all nations to work together harmoniously for the common good. I hope this can become common practice in other fields of human endeavor.

The United States is proud to have a part in this great scientific undertaking. I should like to congratulate all who have helped to make our program possible and particularly the National Academy of Sciences. Through its National Committee for the International Geophysical

¹ Recorded for radio and television broadcast on June 30 (White House press release).

² For background, see BULLETIN of Dec. 3, 1956, p. 880.

Year, the Academy has worked tirelessly to plan and coordinate the program in cooperation with other nations.

I extend congratulations also to the international body whose vision and imagination have not only made the project possible but have woven all the multiple strands together. That body is the International Council of Scientific Unions, representing the major scientific bodies of the world. Through its Special Committee for the International Geophysical Year, the Council has provided brilliant leadership for this enterprise.

We wish the scientists of all nations Godspeed and good luck as the International Geophysical Year begins.

Aid to Jordan

Military Assistance

Press release 399 dated June 29

In response to the request of the Government of Jordan for military assistance, the U.S. Government via an exchange of notes on June 29, 1957,¹ has agreed to provide such aid by procuring for the Kingdom of Jordan military goods and services to the amount of \$10 million.

Economic Aid

Press release 402 dated July 1

In conformance with its previously expressed readiness to consider the economic needs of Jordan, the U.S. Government has, at the request of the Jordan Government, agreed to extend to that Government an additional \$10 million in economic assistance. The exchange of notes to this effect took place in Amman on June 29.¹

Availability of Additional Quantities of Uranium 235

White House press release dated July 3

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

In my statement on February 22, 1956, announcing the designation of 40,000 kilograms of uranium 235 for research and development purposes

and for fueling nuclear power reactors at home and abroad, I stated that the Atomic Energy Commission would recommend that more supplies be made available for sale or lease as necessary in the future for additional nuclear power projects.¹

At the recommendation of the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, in which the Secretaries of State and Defense concur, I have determined under Section 41b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 that 59,800 kilograms of uranium 235, in addition to previous allocations, may be made available for peaceful uses at home and abroad under conditions prescribed by the United States Government.

The additional quantities of uranium 235 which will be made available for distribution over a period of years are:

(a) 30,000 kilograms in the United States, through lease for all licensed civilian purposes, principally for power reactors.

(b) 29,800 kilograms outside the United States, through sale or lease, to Governments of individual nations or to groups of nations with which the United States concludes Agreements for Cooperation.

Distribution of special nuclear material will be subject to prudent safeguards against diversion of the materials to non-peaceful purposes.

Added to the 40,000 kilograms of uranium 235 designated on February 22, 1956, and the 200 kilograms designated earlier, this designation brings to 100,000 kilograms the total amount of this material to be made available as required for peaceful purposes, divided equally between domestic and foreign uses.

At current prices, established by the Atomic Energy Commission last November,² the value of 100,000 kilograms of uranium 235 to be sold or leased is about \$1.7 billion.

I am gratified that the advance toward power and knowledge from the atom is proceeding at a pace which requires provision of additional supplies of the basic atomic fuel.

Further details concerning the new determinations of availability of uranium 235 are set forth in the attached statement by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

¹ BULLETIN of Mar. 19, 1956, p. 469.

² *Ibid.*, Dec. 10, 1956, p. 926.

**STATEMENT BY LEWIS L. STRAUSS
CHAIRMAN, ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION**

In accordance with the President's statement on February 22, 1956, announcing the availability of 40,000 kilograms of uranium 235 for distribution at home and abroad for research and development purposes and for fueling nuclear power reactors, the Atomic Energy Commission has recommended to the President that substantial additional supplies of uranium 235 be designated at this time for distribution for peaceful uses. The President has approved this recommendation.

The Commission's recommendation is due to the progress of nuclear power development. The point has been reached where licenses granted or under consideration by the Commission for nuclear power plants in the United States require more than the initial 20,000 kilograms of uranium 235 made available for domestic use by the President's determination of February 22, 1956. The growing nuclear power programs in friendly nations also require additional supplies of atomic fuel.

The President's current action therefore is another important step in furthering both domestic and foreign applications of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

The present and previous determinations by the President make the uranium 235 available in equal amounts for domestic and foreign distribution. This does not necessarily create a pattern for any subsequent designations that may be recommended.

Each allocation of uranium 235 to atomic power projects in the United States must cover the initial fuel-loading, the estimated amount that will be burned by the reactor during the period for which reactor operation is licensed, and the estimated "pipeline" requirements, that is, the uranium 235 that will be committed in the manufacture of fuel elements, the cooling of irradiated fuel, and the reprocessing of the used fuel to recover the unfissioned uranium 235. Under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the Atomic Energy Commission may issue licenses to domestic reactor operators for fixed periods. Allocations under such licenses now approximate 17,000 kilograms. The new Presidential determination makes a total of 50,000 kilograms available as required for such domestic allocations. The physi-

cal transfers of material will be spread over the periods of the licenses.

Plans of those nations which have concluded or which are now negotiating power agreements with the United States indicate that their needs also will exceed the 20,000 kilograms of uranium 235 previously made available for such use. Their needs are calculated on a basis that includes the initial fuel-loading, "pipeline" requirements, and consumption during the term of the agreement for cooperation. The new Presidential determination makes a total of 50,000 kilograms available as required for distribution abroad.

Seven agreements for cooperation with friendly nations in various parts of the world providing for power reactors are now in effect, seven more are about to be concluded, and a number of others are under negotiation. Twenty-nine agreements for cooperation providing for research reactors are now in effect. Negotiations have been completed on eight additional research agreements, and it is expected that they will become effective within the next year.

The terms of distribution are similar to those in previous determinations. No agreements for cooperation under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 are made by the United States with the Soviet Union or its satellites.

**Nuclear Power Agreements Signed
With France, Germany, and Italy**

The following is a Department announcement of the signing of nuclear power agreements with Germany and Italy and an amendment to the agreement with France, together with texts of statements made by Acting Secretary Herter and Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, following the signing of the agreements.

Press release 408 dated July 3

DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

Nuclear power agreements for cooperation with Germany and Italy as well as an amendment to the existing agreement for cooperation with France were signed on July 3. Acting Secre-

tary Herter and Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, signed the three agreements for the United States. Ambassador Brosio signed for the Italian Government, Ambassador Krekeler for Germany, and Ambassador Alphant for France.

These agreements are similar to other nuclear power agreements and provide the legal framework under which the United States may transfer special nuclear material to fuel the demonstration and power-reactor projects which the three countries intend to undertake. The agreements also provide for the exchange of unclassified information in the broad field of nuclear power technology.

Provisions in the agreements provide a means whereby the rights and obligations of the agreements can be transferred to the European atomic energy community (EURATOM) at such time as the community comes into being and after appropriate negotiations with the United States.

These agreements will not be brought into effect until the parties complete their respective statutory requirements. In the case of the United States, agreements for cooperation must lie before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for 30 days prior to coming into effect.

STATEMENT BY ACTING SECRETARY HERTER

A consistent and major objective of American policy has been to encourage and aid the growth and strengthening of the economies of the Western European countries. With expanding populations and the rapid growth of industry, Western Europe has been confronted by the urgent need for constantly larger amounts of electrical energy to meet their industrial demands. The problem for Europe is that the fuel required to produce this energy exceeds indigenous coal and oil resources.

Confronted by this situation it is logical for Europe to look to the bright hope of atomic energy as a means of satisfying their new and mounting energy requirements. The treaty establishing a European atomic energy community (EURATOM), which is now before the parliaments of the six member countries, would provide a framework to encourage and assist in the development of this new art.

France, Germany, and Italy are already actively engaged in exploring and exploiting atomic energy. The bilateral power agreements for cooperation signed today with the three countries will permit them to move ahead and enlarge the base of their atomic energy programs pending the ratification of the treaty and the establishment of the institutions of the community. The United States sees these interim agreements as another important step in atomic energy development in Europe and as a further expression of the interest of this country in European economic development.

STATEMENT BY ADMIRAL STRAUSS

Your Excellencies: My colleagues and I on the Atomic Energy Commission welcome this step which is being taken today and which enlarges the mutually beneficial cooperation in peaceful applications of atomic energy with the friendly countries which you represent—France, Germany, and Italy.

In the many discussions and information exchanges that have been in progress, we have been greatly impressed by the vision, enthusiasm, and ability of the leaders of your nuclear energy programs. This is exemplified particularly in your participation in the bold plans for community development of nuclear power as a source of urgently needed energy in Europe. I refer, of course, to EURATOM. The program in nuclear power which has been proposed for EURATOM should be of great benefit not only to the participating nations but to universal progress in the new art. And from this progress we of the United States will also derive benefit.

Here in the United States, because we have large conventional fuel resources, the economics of power generation makes it possible for us to pursue a wide-ranging program of research and the construction and operation of many kinds of prototype reactors. The economies of your countries will draw advantages from our success in this field, where United States industry is participating fully and is pioneering in the building of full-scale atomic power plants.

We are confident, as our countries move forward in close cooperation in the development of the peaceful atom, that great progress will be

made in developing atomic energy to serve the increasing needs of a world at peace.

Atoms-for-Peace Agreement With Germany for City of Berlin

The U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State announced on June 28 (press release 396) that an agreement for cooperation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy was signed on that day by representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany, on behalf of Berlin, and representatives of the United States. The Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany, Heinz L. Krekeler, signed the agreement on behalf of the city of Berlin. Commissioner Lewis L. Strauss of the Atomic Energy Commission and C. Burke Elbrick, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, signed for the United States.

The agreement provides for an exchange of information on the design, construction, operation, and use of research reactors, health and safety measures connected with research reactor operation, and on medical, biological, agricultural, and industrial uses of isotopes. There is great interest in nuclear research on the part of the scientific community in Berlin, as well as in the Berlin city government and among leading industrialists. An Institute for Atomic Research has been established with the active cooperation of the Free University and the Technical University. The Institute will bring together the research and training facilities of the two universities in the field and will operate a research reactor when it is obtained. The signing of the research agreement is another example of continuing United States confidence in and support of Free Berlin.

The U.S. Atomic Energy Commission has agreed to make available to the Senat of Berlin 6 kilograms (13.2 lbs.) of U-235 contained in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent for reactor fuel. Berlin may also receive from the United States limited gram quantities of highly enriched U-235, plutonium, and U-233 for research purposes. The Senat of Berlin assumes responsibility for using and safeguarding the fissionable material in accordance with the terms of the proposed agreement.

The agreement will enter into force following completion of the necessary statutory and constitutional requirements of both Governments.

Working Group To Consider Asian Regional Nuclear Center

Press release 395 dated June 27

Invitations have been issued by the United States to the other 16 nations which are members of the Colombo Plan Consultative Committee to send representatives to a working group meeting at Washington on July 8 to consider the establishment of an Asian Regional Nuclear Center at Manila.

The proposed center would be part of the atoms-for-peace program which President Eisenhower announced before the U.N. General Assembly on December 8, 1953. The President pledged the determination of the United States to find the way by which this inventiveness of man could be adapted to peaceful uses to bring vast improvements in living standards, health, and happiness.

First proposed in October 1955 by ICA Director John B. Hollister, acting as U.S. representative at the Colombo Plan meeting at Singapore,¹ the research center would be an effort to bring the benefits of atomic energy to the peoples of the Asian Colombo Plan nations on a cooperative basis. It was pointed out at that time that the proposed center could supplement existing facilities for the basic training of engineers, chemists, and physicists at the college level. It could also offer facilities for research in the fields of medicine, agriculture, and industry. The center would make available at a single site laboratories and major equipment required for training and research. One function envisioned for the center would be to provide training for instructors and teachers in nuclear science for other Asian educational institutions.

Mr. Hollister said,

... if such an institution is to come into vigorous life and to serve well the needs of the Asian world in this new field, it must rest firmly on Asia's interest and

¹ BULLETIN of Nov. 7, 1955, p. 747.

support. The center as we see it would be established for students of the region, staffed largely by scientists from the region, supervised by administrators from the region, and supported by governments of the region. The burden of setting up the center and carrying it forward, and the obligation of staffing it, would rest with the Asian members of the Colombo Plan. The fruits of the effort would also belong to Asia.

In 1956 ICA engaged the Brookhaven National Laboratory to send a group of eminent American scientists throughout the Far East and South and Southeast Asia to study the possibilities and potentialities for the center. In its report, made in November 1956, the Brookhaven Laboratory declared that, while there are a number of major problems in such an undertaking, "the establishment of an Asian Regional Nuclear Center is considered to be entirely feasible, and capable of contributing significantly to the scientific and technological development of the region." The report also indicated that initially the Colombo Plan nations may not have available the required number of experienced scientific and administrative personnel at the center and concluded that special attention would have to be given to meeting top-level staff requirements.

Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, at the Colombo Plan Consultative Committee meeting at Wellington, New Zealand, in December 1956 said that the United States was prepared to contribute approximately \$20 million to the establishment of the center provided that mutually satisfactory arrangements could be worked out with the other participating countries.² The \$20 million would come from the \$100 million President's Fund for Asian Economic Development which the Congress made available in fiscal year 1956 to the President for such multicountry projects. The ICA was designated by the President to administer the fund.

Assistant Secretary Robertson in his Wellington speech reiterated the necessity of Asia's interest and support for the proposed center and concluded:

My Government feels that this cooperative plan for developing in Asia the peaceful use of atomic energy holds limitless potential. We envision this first nuclear training center in Asia as a pioneer among educational institutions in the most far-reaching, frontier-opening technical science so far known to man.

² *Ibid.*, Dec. 17, 1956, p. 957.

If it can accomplish its high purpose, the center will be a crowning achievement of the Colombo Plan. It will demonstrate to the world in bold and positive terms the spirit in which the plan was born and through which it has increasingly flourished: the spirit of mutual effort for the common good.

At its meeting in July, which is expected to continue from 10 days to 2 weeks, the working group will discuss the problems raised by the Brookhaven report and make specific recommendations to the respective governments for their solution.

Robert McClintock, former Ambassador to Cambodia, will be the U.S. delegate. Senior scientific adviser will be Leland J. Haworth, director of Brookhaven National Laboratory.

Nations which have been invited to send representatives to the meeting are Australia, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, India, Indonesia, Japan, Laos, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, the United Kingdom, and Viet-Nam.

Administration of Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act

White House press release dated June 18

WHITE HOUSE ANNOUNCEMENT

The President on June 17 issued an Executive order providing for the administration of the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956.

The principal assignments of activities made by the order are as follows:

(1) The United States Information Agency will be responsible for (a) allocating to the appropriate Government agencies the funds made available for carrying out the act, (b) advising and keeping the President informed with respect to the functions provided for in the act, and (c) coordinating those functions.

(2) The Department of State will administer United States participation in the Brussels Universal and International Exhibition, to be held at Brussels, Belgium, in 1958. The State Department will also administer the cultural exchange program, which consists of (a) tours abroad by United States artists and athletes, individually and in groups, who represent any field of the arts,

sports, or any other form of cultural attainment, and (b) United States representation in artistic, dramatic, musical, sports, and other cultural festivals, competitions, and like exhibitions abroad. The USIA is also authorized to participate in the administration of such representation.

(3) The Department of Commerce will administer functions relating to United States participation in international fairs and expositions abroad, including trade and industrial fairs and other public or private demonstrations of United States accomplishments and cultural attainments, but exclusive of the Brussels exhibition.

The assignments of responsibilities to agencies effected by the order, as outlined above, accord generally with the assignments heretofore existing on a less formalized basis.

The statute provides: "The purpose of this act is to strengthen the ties which unite us with other nations by demonstrating the cultural interests, developments, and achievements of the people of the United States, and the contributions being made by the United States economic and social system toward a peaceful and more fruitful life for its own people and other people throughout the world; and thus to assist in the development of friendly, sympathetic, and peaceful relations between the United States and the other countries of the world."

EXECUTIVE ORDER 10716¹

ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL EXCHANGE AND TRADE FAIR PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1956

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 778), by section 301 of title 3 of the United States Code, and as President of the United States, it is hereby ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. United States Information Agency. (a) Except in respect of the functions delegated by section 2(c), or reserved by section 4, of this order, the Director of the United States Information Agency shall coordinate the functions provided for in the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 (hereinafter referred to as the Act) and shall be responsible for advising the President and keeping him informed with respect to the said functions:

(b) The following-designated functions conferred upon the President by the Act are hereby delegated to the Director of the United States Information Agency:

(1) The functions so conferred by the provisions of

section 3(2) of the Act (the provisions of section 2(b) of this order notwithstanding).

(2) The functions so conferred by section 3(4) of the Act (the provisions of sections 2(d) and 3(b) of this order notwithstanding).

(3) The functions so conferred by section 11 of the Act, except to the extent that such functions are delegated by section 2(c) of this order.

(4) The functions so conferred by sections 4, 6, and 7 of the Act to the extent that they pertain to the functions delegated by the foregoing provisions of this section.

(c) The Director of the United States Information Agency, with such assistance of the Department of State and the Department of Commerce as may be appropriate, shall prepare and transmit to the President the reports which the President is required to transmit to the Congress by section 9 of the Act.

(d) The Director of the United States Information Agency shall consult with the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Commerce, or both, in connection with the establishment of any interagency committees under the authority delegated by section 1(b) (3) of this order the activities of which will pertain to functions delegated by section 2 or section 3 of this order, or both, respectively.

(e) Funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the President to carry out the purposes of the Act shall be allocated by the Director of the United States Information Agency to the Department of State as may be necessary to carry out the functions delegated under section 2 of this order; to the Department of Commerce as may be necessary to carry out the functions delegated under section 3 of this order; and to such other departments or agencies of the Government as may be deemed necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act. The agencies to which funds are so allocated shall obtain apportionments thereof directly from the Bureau of the Budget.

SEC. 2. Department of State. Subject to the provisions of sections 1 (a) and 4 of this order, the following-designated functions conferred upon the President by the Act are hereby delegated to the Secretary of State:

(a) The functions so conferred by sections 3 (1), 10 (b), and 10 (c) (3) of the Act.

(b) The functions so conferred by section 3 (2) of the Act (the provisions of section 1 (b) (1) of this order notwithstanding).

(c) The functions so conferred by section 3 (3) of the Act to the extent that they pertain to the Universal and International Exhibition of Brussels, 1958, together with the functions so conferred by section 11 of the Act to the extent that they pertain to the said Exhibition.

(d) The functions so conferred by sections 3 (4), 4, 6, and 7 of the Act to the extent that they pertain to the functions delegated by the foregoing provisions of this section.

SEC. 3. Department of Commerce. Subject to the provisions of sections 1 (a) and 4 of this order, the following-designated functions conferred upon the President by the Act are hereby delegated to the Secretary of Commerce:

(a) The functions so conferred by section 3 (3) of the Act, exclusive of functions pertaining to the Universal and International Exhibition of Brussels, 1958.

(b) The functions so conferred by sections 3 (4), 4, 6,

¹ 22 Fed. Reg. 4345.

and 7 of the Act to the extent that they pertain to the functions delegated by the foregoing provisions of this section.

SEC. 4. Functions reserved to the President. There are hereby excluded from the functions delegated by the provisions of this order the functions conferred upon the President (a) with respect to the appointment of officers authorized to be appointed by the first proviso of section 3 (3) of the Act, (b) with respect to the transmittal of periodic reports to the Congress under section 9 of the Act, and (c) with respect to the waiver of provisions of law or limitations of authority under section 8 of the Act.

SEC. 5. Procedures for coordination abroad. The provisions of Part II of Executive Order No. 10575 of November 6, 1954 (19 F. R. 7249),² are hereby extended and made applicable to the functions provided for in the Act and to United States agencies and personnel concerned with the administration abroad of the said functions.

SEC. 6. Definition. As used in this order, the word "functions" embraces duties, powers, responsibilities, authority, and discretion.

SEC. 7. Prior directives and actions. This order supercedes the provisions of the letters of the President to the Director of the United States Information Agency dated August 16, 1955, and August 21, 1956, and the letter of the President to the Secretary of State dated December 27, 1956 (22 F. R. 101-103); provided that this order shall not operate to terminate any authority to perform functions without regard to the provisions of law and limitations of authority specified in those letters. Except to the extent that they may be inconsistent with law or with this order, other directives, regulations, and actions relating to the functions delegated by this order and in force immediately prior to the issuance of this order shall remain in effect until amended, modified, or revoked by appropriate authority.

SEC. 8. Effective date. Without prejudice to anything done under proper authority with respect to any function under the Act at any time subsequent to the approval of the Act and prior to the issuance of this order, the effective date of this order shall be deemed to be the date on which the Act was approved.

Dwight D. Eisenhower

THE WHITE HOUSE,
June 17, 1957.

Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy

85th Congress, 1st Session

Personnel Practices of the Department of State. Hearings before the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. April 4 and 10, 1957. 111 pp.

² BULLETIN of Dec. 13, 1954, p. 914.

Building a World of Free Peoples. Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs at Laconia, N.H. April 5, 1957. 121 pp.

Operation of Article VII, NATO Status of Forces Treaty. Hearing before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services to review for the period December 1, 1955, to November 30, 1956, the operation of article VII of the agreement between the parties of the North Atlantic Treaty regarding the status of their forces. April 9, 1957. 45 pp.

National Science Foundation, Report on International Geophysical Year. Hearings before the Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations. May 1, 1957. 126 pp.

Authorizing the Sale or Loan of Vessels to Friendly Foreign Nations. Report to accompany H. R. 6952. H. Rept. 387, May 6, 1957. 10 pp.

Study of Raw Materials of Soviet Union and Certain Eastern Hemisphere Countries. Report to accompany S. Res. 78. S. Rept. 288, May 8, 1957. 2 pp.

Protocol Amending the International Sugar Agreement of 1953, Dated at London, December 1, 1956. Message from the President transmitting a certified copy of the protocol. S. Exec. L, May 8, 1957. 15 pp.

Amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as Amended. Report to accompany S. 2051. S. Rept. 296, May 9, 1957. 34 pp.

Amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as Amended. Report to accompany H. R. 7383. H. Rept. 435, May 9, 1957. 40 pp.

Extension of Public Law 480. Report to accompany H. R. 6974. H. Rept. 432, May 9, 1957. 18 pp.

Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on S. Exec. I. May 10-20, 1957. 258 pp.

Control and Reduction of Armaments. Disarmament and Security in Latin America. Staff Study No. 7, Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. May 12, 1957. 29 pp. [Committee print.]

Foreign Aid. Report of the Senate Special Committee To Study the Foreign Aid Program, pursuant to S. Res. 285, 84th Cong., and S. Res. 35, 85th Cong. S. Rept. 300, May 13, 1957. 38 pp.

Enabling Act To Provide for the Implementation of the Pink Salmon Treaty Between United States and Canada, Signed at Ottawa, Canada, December 28, 1956. Report to accompany S. 1806. S. Rept. 302, May 13, 1957. 12 pp.

Seventeenth Semiannual Report on Educational Exchange Activities, July 1-December 31, 1956, by the U. S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange. H. Doc. 176, May 13, 1957. 6 pp.

Review of the Budget Formulation and Presentation Practices of the International Cooperation Administration. Fifth Report by the House Committee on Government Operations. H. Rept. 449, May 15, 1957. 19 pp.

Extension of Export-Import Bank Act of 1945. Report to accompany H. R. 4136. S. Rept. 331, May 16, 1957. 5 pp.

Report of the Special Study Mission to Europe on Policy Toward the Satellite Nations of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. May 16, 1957. 25 pp. [Committee print.]

Inventory Report on Real Property Leased to the United States Throughout the World as of July 1, 1956, prepared by the General Services Administration at the request of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. S. Doc. 41, May 20, 1957. 69 pp.

Mutual Security Programs. Message from the President transmitting proposals relative to our mutual security programs. H. Doc. 182, May 21, 1957. 9 pp.

Clarifying the General Powers, Increasing the Borrowing Authority, and Authorizing the Deferment of Interest Payments on Borrowings, of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. Report to accompany H. R. 5728. H. Rept. 473, May 22, 1957. 15 pp.

Mutual Security Act of 1957. Hearings before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the executive branch proposed draft bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954. Part I, May 22-24, 1957, 109 pp.; Part II, May 28-June 5, 1957, 171 pp.

Extending to January 31, 1958, the Authority of the Senate Special Committee To Study the Foreign Aid Program. Report to accompany S. Res. 141. S. Rept. 373, May 23, 1957. 3 pp.

Pink Salmon Protocol. Report to accompany Exec. C, 85th Cong., 1st sess. S. Exec. Rept. 2, May 23, 1957. 4 pp.

International Health. Report of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the organization and financing of, and the participation of, the United States in international health programs, pursuant to sec. 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Cong., and H. Res. 99, 85th Cong. H. Rept. 474, May 23, 1957. 73 pp.

Reports from the Senate Special Committee To Study the Foreign Aid Program. Report to accompany S. Con. Res. 30. S. Rept. 390, May 29, 1957. 3 pp.

First Balance-of-Payments Consultations Under GATT

Press release 403 dated July 1

The Department of State announced on July 1 the conclusion of the first stage of balance-of-payments consultations in Geneva under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

These consultations, which took place over a 3-week period in Geneva, were held with Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Italy, the Netherlands, Greece, Austria, and Germany. Under the GATT, countries maintaining restrictions on trade for balance-of-payments reasons have agreed to consult upon request regarding their need for continuing such restrictions and the manner in which they apply them. At last fall's regular session of the GATT, a U.S. proposal that such consultations be held this year was adopted.¹

Two Western European countries announced the removal of import restrictions on an important range of goods from the United States and other dollar countries. These new measures of dollar-trade liberalization were announced by Sweden and Italy at the recently concluded consultations on import restrictions maintained because of shortages of foreign exchange. In addition, Austria and Germany announced that they would take liberalization steps in the near future.

With regard to the Federal Republic of Germany, it was noted that the strong foreign-

exchange position of that country no longer justified the maintenance of restrictions for balance-of-payments reasons under the general agreement. The Government of the Federal Republic expressed its firm intention to consider the measures to be adopted in the light of this situation and announced that further liberalization steps would be taken in the near future. In particular, the German Government stated that differences now existing between three quota-free lists applicable to various currency areas would be reduced gradually.

In addition to the new liberalization measures made public at the meetings, a number of the consulting countries reported other recently adopted measures which reduce restrictions against dollar imports, thereby placing them on a more equal competitive basis with similar goods coming from nondollar areas. Under Norway's import quotas, for example, dollar goods are normally treated as favorably as any other goods. The Netherlands and Greece reported that, for almost all practical purposes, dollar and nondollar goods are treated equally by their import control authorities and that their remaining quantitative import restrictions are negligible.

All consulting countries reported that, as their financial position improves, they intend to ease their remaining restrictions on dollar imports. Some noted, however, that domestic problems, notably in the agricultural field, will require the maintenance of import restrictions on a few products for some time.

Other countries maintaining import restrictions for balance-of-payments reasons will consult under the same GATT provision in September and October. These include France, Turkey, Finland, Japan, United Kingdom, Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Australia, Ceylon, New Zealand, Pakistan, Union of South Africa, and India.

Details of the new liberalization measures announced at the meeting will, as usual, be reported in the Department of Commerce's publication *Foreign Commerce Weekly* and in the Department of Agriculture's *Foreign Agriculture*.

The consultations—the first of their kind held under GATT auspices—afforded an opportunity for a frank and full exchange of views regarding the continued need for quantitative restrictions and the desirability of eliminating them as soon as conditions permit.

¹ BULLETIN of Dec. 3, 1956, p. 893.

Revision of Tariff Quotas on Potatoes

White House press release dated May 16

WHITE HOUSE ANNOUNCEMENT

The President on May 16 issued a proclamation decreasing the quantity of potatoes dutiable at 37½ cents per 100 pounds under the seed and table-stock potato tariff quotas set forth in the United States schedule to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The revised tariff quotas will become effective on September 15, 1957, the beginning of the next quota year.

In giving effect to the reductions of the tariff quotas negotiated with Canada,¹ the proclamation makes two supplementary adjustments in rates for certain potatoes pursuant to prior agreements. In order to prevent an increase in the margin of duty preference accorded Cuban table-stock potatoes beyond that permitted by article I, paragraph 4, of the general agreement, the proclamation fixes an appropriate rate for non-Cuban table-stock potatoes withdrawn from the prior tariff quota and imported during December, January, or February. In addition, the proclamation fixes a preferential rate for table-stock potatoes withdrawn from the prior quota, if they are the product of Cuba and are imported from March through November. This preference is provided for in the 1947 exclusive trade agreement with Cuba.

Beginning on September 15, 1957, the following rates of duty will be applicable to imports of seed and table-stock potatoes (other than the product of the Philippines or Soviet-bloc countries):

1. Seed potatoes within the new tariff quota of 1,900,000 bushels (formerly 2,500,000 bushels) will remain dutiable at 37½ cents per 100 pounds, and all imports in excess of the quota, whether or not the product of Cuba, will become subject to the full duty of 75 cents.

2. Imports of table-stock potatoes not in excess of the new tariff quota of 600,000 bushels (subject to increase if estimated U. S. production falls below 350,000,000 bushels) will remain dutiable at 37½ cents per 100 pounds except that the rate applicable to Cuban potatoes during the winter months of December, January, and February will continue to be 30 cents.

3. Imports of non-Cuban table-stock potatoes

in excess of the new tariff quota, but not in excess of the old tariff quota of 1,000,000 bushels (subject to a similar increase), will become dutiable at 75 cents per 100 pounds except that the rate will become 60 cents during the specified winter months; such imports which are the product of Cuba will become dutiable at 67½ cents except that the rate will remain 30 cents during the specified winter months.

4. Imports of table-stock potatoes in excess of the old tariff quota will remain dutiable at 75 cents per 100 pounds, whether or not the product of Cuba, except that those which are the product of Cuba will remain dutiable at 30 cents during the specified winter months.

PROCLAMATION 3184²

TERMINATING IN PART PROCLAMATION NO. 2761A OF DECEMBER 16, 1947, WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN POTATOES, AND MAKING RELATED ADJUSTMENTS

1. WHEREAS, pursuant to the authority vested in him by the Constitution and the statutes, including section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (48 Stat. (pt. 1) 943, ch. 474, 57 Stat. (pt. 1) 125, ch. 118, 59 Stat. (pt. 1) 410, ch. 269), the President on October 30, 1947, entered into a trade agreement with certain foreign countries, which trade agreement consists of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the Protocol of Provisional Application of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, together with a Final Act (61 Stat. (pts. 5 and 6) A7, A11, and A2050);

2. WHEREAS by Proclamation No. 2761A of December 16, 1947 (61 Stat. (pt. 2) 1103), the President proclaimed such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions of the United States of America and such continuance of existing customs or excise treatment of articles imported into the United States of America as were then found to be required or appropriate to carry out the said trade agreement specified in the first recital of this proclamation on and after January 1, 1948, which proclamation has been supplemented by the other proclamations listed in the third recital of Proclamation No. 3140 of June 13, 1956 (3 CFR, 1956 Supp., p. 24), by the said proclamation of June 13, 1956, by Proclamation No. 3143 of June 25, 1956 (3 CFR, 1956 Supp., p. 33), by Proclamation No. 3146, of June 29, 1956 (3 CFR, 1956 Supp., p. 35), and by Proclamation No. 3180 of September 28, 1956 (3 CFR, 1956 Supp., p. 44);

3. WHEREAS items 771 [first] and 771 [second], and the appropriate headings, in Part I of Schedule XX annexed to the said General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which items were given effect by the said proclamation of December 16, 1947, read as follows:

¹ BULLETIN of May 13, 1957, p. 773.

² 22 Fed. Reg. 3531.

Tariff Act of 1930, paragraph	Description of products	Rate of duty
771	White or Irish seed potatoes, certified by a responsible officer or agency of a foreign government in accordance with the official rules and regulations of that government to have been grown and approved especially for use as seed, in containers marked with the foreign government's official certified seed potato tags. <i>Provided</i> , That the quantity of such potatoes entitled to entry at such rate of duty shall not exceed— for the period from January 1 to September 14, inclusive, in 1948, 2,500,000 bushels of 60 pounds each, less the quantity of such potatoes entered and subject to duty at a tariff-quota rate during the period from September 15 to December 31, inclusive, in 1947, or for any 12-month period beginning on September 15 in 1948 or any subsequent year, 2,500,000 bushels of 60 pounds each; and any such potatoes not subject to that rate of duty shall be dutiable at.	37½¢ per 100 lb.
771	White or Irish potatoes, other than certified seed potatoes, as defined in the preceding item <i>Provided</i> , That the quantity of such potatoes entitled to entry at such rate of duty shall not exceed— for the period from January 1 to September 14, inclusive, in 1948, 1,000,000 bushels of 60 pounds each, less the quantity of such potatoes entered and subject to duty at a tariff-quota rate during the period from September 15 to December 31, inclusive, in 1947, or for any 12-month period beginning on September 15 in 1948 or any subsequent year, 1,000,000 bushels of 60 pounds each; and any such potatoes not subject to that rate of duty shall be dutiable at. <i>Provided further</i> , That if for any calendar year the production of white or Irish potatoes, including seed potatoes, in the United States, according to the estimate made as of September 1 by the United States Department of Agriculture, is less than 350,000,000 bushels of 60 pounds each, an additional quantity of such potatoes, other than certified seed potatoes, equal to the	75¢ per 100 lb. 37½¢ per 100 lb. 75¢ per 100 lb.

amount by which such estimated production is less than 350,000,000 bushels may be entered during the 12-month period beginning on September 15 of that year at . . . 37½¢ per 100 lb.

Provided further, That in computing the quantities of imports specified in the two foregoing provisos white or Irish potatoes produced in the Republic of Cuba shall not be included.

4. WHEREAS agreement for the partial withdrawal of the said items 771 [first] and 771 [second], so that they would be applied as though they read as follows, has been reached as compensatory adjustment, under paragraph 1 of Article XXVIII of the said General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, for a modification thereunder by Canada of its tariff concession on potatoes in the said General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade:

Tariff Act of 1930, paragraph	Description of products	Rate of duty
771	White or Irish seed potatoes, certified by a responsible officer or agency of a foreign government in accordance with the official rules and regulations of that government to have been grown and approved especially for use as seed, in containers marked with the foreign government's official certified seed potato tags. <i>Provided</i> , That not more than 1,900,000 bushels of 60 pounds each of such potatoes entered during any 12-month period beginning on September 15 in any year shall be dutiable at 37½ cents per 100 pounds; and any such potatoes entered during any such 12-month period in excess of 2,500,000 bushels of 60 pounds each shall be dutiable at.	37½¢ per 100 lb. 75¢ per 100 lb.
771	White or Irish potatoes, other than certified seed potatoes as defined in the preceding item <i>Provided</i> , That not more than 600,000 bushels of 60 pounds each of such potatoes entered during any 12-month period beginning on September 15 in any year shall be dutiable at 37½ cents per 100 pounds; and any such potatoes entered during any such 12-month period in excess of 1,000,000 bushels of 60 pounds each shall be dutiable at. <i>Provided further</i> , That if for any calendar year the production of white or Irish potatoes, including seed potatoes, in the United States, ac-	37½¢ per 100 lb. 75¢ per 100 lb.

According to the estimate made as of September 1 by the United States Department of Agriculture, is less than 350,000,000 bushels of 60 pounds each, an additional quantity of such potatoes, other than certified seed potatoes, equal to the amount by which such estimated production is less than 350,000,000 bushels shall be added to each of the quantities specified in the preceding proviso in this item for the purpose of determining the application of the rates provided for in this item during the 12-month period beginning on September 15 of that calendar year; and

Provided further, That in computing the quantity of imports specified in the foregoing provisos to this item white or Irish potatoes produced in the Republic of Cuba shall not be included.

tity of such potatoes, other than certified seed potatoes, equal to the amount by which such estimated production is less than 350,000,000 bushels shall be added to each of the quantities specified in this item for the purpose of determining the application of the rate provided for in this item during the following months of December, January, and February.

5. WHEREAS, in view of the partial termination of the said proclamation of December 16, 1947, pursuant to the agreement referred to in the fourth recital of this proclamation, provided for in Part I of this proclamation, I determine that it is required or appropriate to carry out the said trade agreement specified in the first recital of this proclamation that the following new item be inserted, following item 765, in the list set forth in the sixteenth recital of the said proclamation of June 13, 1956, as amended by the said proclamation of September 28, 1956:

Tariff Act of 1930, paragraph	Description of products	Rate of duty
771	White or Irish potatoes, other than certified seed potatoes as defined in item 771 [first] in Part I of Schedule XX to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (Geneva—1947), as modified, entered during the period from December 1, in any year, to the last day of the following February, inclusive, if at the time such potatoes are entered the quantity of such potatoes (other than the product of Cuba) which had theretofore been entered after the preceding September 14 exceeds 600,000 bushels of 60 pounds each, but does not exceed 1,000,000 bushels of 60 pounds each	60¢ per 100 lb.
	<i>Provided</i> , That if for any calendar year the production of white or Irish potatoes, including seed potatoes, in the United States, according to the estimate made as of September 1 by the United States Department of Agriculture, is less than 350,000,000 bushels of 60 pounds each, an additional quan-	

6. WHEREAS, pursuant to the authority vested in him by the Constitution and the statutes, including the said section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the President on October 30, 1947, entered into an exclusive trade agreement with the Government of the Republic of Cuba (61 Stat. (pt. 4) 3699), which exclusive trade agreement includes certain portions of other documents made a part thereof and provides for the treatment in respect of ordinary customs duties of products of the Republic of Cuba imported into the United States of America;

7. WHEREAS by Proclamation No. 2764 of January 1, 1948 (62 Stat. (pt. 2) 1465), the President proclaimed such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions of the United States of America and such continuance of existing customs or excise treatment of articles imported into the United States of America as were then found to be required or appropriate to carry out the said agreement specified in the sixth recital of this proclamation on and after January 1, 1948, which proclamation has been supplemented by Proclamation No. 3105, of July 22, 1955 (69 Stat. C44), by the other proclamations listed in the thirteenth recital of the said proclamation of June 13, 1956, and by the said proclamation of June 13, 1956; and

8. WHEREAS, in view of the partial termination of the said proclamation of December 16, 1947, pursuant to the agreement referred to in the fourth recital of this proclamation, provided for in Part I of this proclamation, I determine that it is required or appropriate to carry out the said exclusive trade agreement specified in the sixth recital of this proclamation that the following new item be inserted, in numerical order, in the list set forth in the sixteenth recital of the said proclamation of July 22, 1955, as amended by the said proclamation of June 13, 1956:

Tariff Act of 1930, paragraph	Description of products	Rate of duty
771	White or Irish potatoes, other than certified seed potatoes as defined in item 771 [first] in Part I of Schedule XX to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (Geneva—1947), as modified, entered at any time, other than during the period December 1 to	

the last day of the following February, inclusive, if at the time such potatoes are entered the quantity of such potatoes (other than the product of Cuba) which had theretofore been entered after the preceding September 14 exceeds 600,000 bushels of 60 pounds each, but does not exceed 1,000,000 bushels of 60 pounds each

67½¢ per lb.^a

Provided, That if for any calendar year the production of white or Irish potatoes, including seed potatoes, in the United States, according to the estimate made as of September 1 by the United States Department of Agriculture, is less than 350,000,000 bushels of 60 pounds each, an additional quantity of such potatoes, other than certified seed potatoes, equal to the amount by which such estimated production is less than 350,000,000 bushels shall be added to each of the quantities specified in this item for the purpose of determining the application of the rate provided for in this item during that part of the 12-month period, beginning on September 15 of that year, to which this item is applicable.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, President of the United States of America, acting under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes, including the said section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, do proclaim, effective on and after September 15, 1957, as follows:

Part I

In accordance with the agreement specified in the fourth recital of this proclamation, the said items 771 [first] and 771 [second] set forth in the third recital of this proclamation are withdrawn in part and the said proclamation of December 16, 1947, is terminated in part so far as it relates to potatoes provided for in such items but not provided for in the same items as set forth in the fourth recital of this proclamation, with the result that the said proclamation of December 16, 1947, shall be applied as though the said items 771 [first] and 771 [second] read as set forth in the fourth recital of this proclamation.

Part II

To the end that the trade agreement specified in the first recital of this proclamation may be carried out, the list set forth in the thirteenth recital^a of the said proclamation of June 13, 1956, as amended, shall be further amended by the insertion therein of the new item as set forth in the fifth recital of this proclamation.

Part III

To the end that the exclusive trade agreement specified in the sixth recital of this proclamation may be carried out, the list set forth in the thirteenth recital^a of the said

^a For correction, see p. 163.

proclamation of July 22, 1955, as amended, shall be further amended by the insertion therein of the new item as set forth in the eighth recital of this proclamation.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

DONE at the City of Washington this sixteenth day of May in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and [SEAL] fifty-seven, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-first.

Dwight D. Eisenhower

By the President:

JOHN FOSTER DULLES
Secretary of State

Supplemental Trade Agreement With Cuba

The United States and Cuba signed a supplementary trade agreement on June 20. Following is a Department announcement, together with the text of the agreement, released on the day of the signing (press release 376), followed by a White House announcement and the text of a Presidential proclamation giving effect to the concessions negotiated with Cuba (White House press release dated June 28).

DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT, JUNE 20

The Governments of the United States and Cuba on June 20 signed a supplementary trade agreement as a result of negotiations conducted at Habana under the auspices of the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The agreement provides for U.S. tariff concessions to Cuba on five types of cigar tobacco in return for tariff concessions by Cuba to the United States on tinplate and tinned sheets, artificial colors, and motors.

As shown in the accompanying tables, existing rates of duty are to be reduced by 10 percent in two annual stages for both the United States and Cuban concessions. In both countries the first

Cuban Tariff Concessions to the United States

Cuban tariff item no.	Description	Rate of duty			U. S. ex- ports to Cuba 1955 (\$1,000)
		Present	Supplemental agreement		
			1st stage	2d stage	
37-C	Rolled sheets: Tinned and in tinplate, unmarked, not litho- graphed.	0.075 pesos per 100 kgs.	0.07125 pesos per 100 kgs.	0.0675 pesos per 100 kgs.	4, 824
85-A ex	Artificial colors: In powder or lumps, except metallic blues (indigo) in balls or squares.	0.40 pesos per 100 kgs.	0.38 pesos per 100 kgs.	0.36 pesos per 100 kgs.	882
217	Motors of all kinds, fixed or not, including windmills, and the loose parts and accessories for the same, not specifically classified.	5% ad valorem	4.75% ad valorem . . .	4.50% ad valorem . . .	3, 098
	Total	8, 804

U. S. Tariff Concessions to Cuba and Changes in Most-Favored-Nation Rates Applicable to Products of Other Countries

Tariff para- graph	Schedule A No.	Schedule A commodity description	Rate of duty				U. S. im- ports for consump- tion 1956 (\$1,000)
			Applicable to products of:	Present	Supplemental agreement		
					1st stage	2d stage	
601	2601. 000	Tobacco, unmanufactured Leaf for cigar wrappers: Unstemmed	Cuba	91¢ per lb.	86.45¢ per lb.	\$1.9¢ per lb.	2, 340
			Other	\$1.00 per lb.	95.45¢ per lb.	90.9¢ per lb.	784
	2601. 100	Stemmed	Cuba	\$1.72 per lb.	\$1.634 per lb.	\$1.548 per lb.
			Other	\$1. 72 per lb.	\$1.634 per lb.	\$1.548 per lb.	1
	2603. 000	Cigar leaf (filler): Unstemmed	Cuba	14¢ per lb.	13.3¢ per lb.	12.6¢ per lb.	4, 316
			Other	17.5¢ per lb.	16.8¢ per lb.	16.1¢ per lb.	103
603	2604. 000	Stemmed	Cuba	20¢ per lb.	19¢ per lb.	18¢ per lb.	13, 035
			Other	25¢ per lb.	24¢ per lb.	23¢ per lb.	144
	2609. 000	Scrap tobacco	Cuba	14¢ per lb.	13.3¢ per lb.	12.6¢ per lb.	5, 907
			Other	17.5¢ per lb.	16.8¢ per lb.	16.1¢ per lb.	1, 482
		Totals: Cuba Other					25, 598 2, 514

stage will become effective on June 29, 1957, and the second stage would normally become effective a year later.

The U.S. tariff concessions on tobacco are expected to benefit U.S. cigar manufacturers, whose requirements for Cuban cigar tobacco led last year to imports valued at \$25.6 million of the five types of tobacco for which the tariff treatment is being modified. Tobacco which is the product of Cuba benefits, on four of these five types of tobacco, by preferential rates which are lower than those applicable to tobacco produced in other countries.

When the tariff reductions applicable to Cuba are made effective, there will at the same time be equal decreases in the rates applicable to other countries in order to avoid widening the margins of preference on the four types of tobacco and creating a margin of preference on the fifth type. An increase in the margins of preference would be contrary to the longstanding policy of the United States Government directed toward the elimination of discriminatory treatment in international trade and contrary to the applicable procedures under the general agreement.

The accompanying tabulation of the U.S. concessions to Cuba also shows the rates of duty now applicable to countries other than Cuba and the rates which will be applied to keep margins of preference unchanged.

The concessions granted to the United States by Cuba are expected to benefit United States exporters of the specified items—tinplate and tinned sheets, artificial colors, and motors. Exports of these items from the United States to Cuba in 1955 were valued at nearly \$9 million.

TEXT OF AGREEMENT

EIGHTH PROTOCOL OF SUPPLEMENTARY CONCESSIONS TO THE GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

(CUBA AND UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)

The governments which are contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (hereinafter referred to as "the contracting parties" and "the General Agreement" respectively), having agreed upon procedures for the conduct of tariff negotiations by two or more contracting parties under the General Agreement and for putting into effect under the Agreement the results of such negotiations,

The Governments of the Republic of Cuba and of the United States of America which are contracting parties to the General Agreement (hereinafter referred to as "negotiating contracting parties") having carried out tariff negotiations under these procedures and being desirous of so giving effect to the results of these negotiations,

IT IS AGREED:

1. On the thirtieth day following the day upon which this Protocol shall have been signed by a negotiating contracting party or on June 29, 1957, whichever is the earlier, the schedule relating to that contracting party annexed hereto shall enter into force and shall be regarded as a schedule to the General Agreement relating to that contracting party.

2. In each case in which Article II of the General Agreement refers to the date of that Agreement, the applicable date in respect of the schedules annexed to this Protocol shall be the date of this Protocol.

3. (a) The original text of this Protocol, together with the annex thereto, shall be deposited with the Executive Secretary to the CONTRACTING PARTIES to the General Agreement. It shall be open for signature by contracting parties at the close of the negotiations and thereafter at the headquarters of the CONTRACTING PARTIES until six months following the date of the Protocol.

(b) The Executive Secretary shall promptly furnish a certified copy of this Protocol, and a notification of each signature to this Protocol, to each contracting party.

4. The date of this Protocol shall be June 20, 1957.

DONE at La Habana in a single copy in the English and French languages, both texts authentic except as otherwise specified in schedules annexed hereto.

For the Republic of Cuba:

GUEL¹

For the United States of America:

VINTON CHAPIN

Annex

SCHEDULE IX—CUBA

(This Schedule is authentic only in the English language)

PART I

MOST-FAVORED-NATION TARIFF

Nil

PART II

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF

Cuban Tariff Item Number	Description of Products	Rate of Duty
37 37-C	Rolled sheets: Tinned and in tinplate, unmarked, not litho- graphed.	(Specific duty in Cuban pesos) (a) 0.07125 per 100 Kgs. (b) 0.0675 per 100 Kgs.
85 85-A ex	Artificial colors: In powder or lumps, ex- cept metallic blues (in- digo) in balls or squares.	(a) 0.38 per 100 Kgs. (b) 0.36 per 100 Kgs.
217	Motors of all kinds, fixed or not, including wind- mills, and the loose parts and accessories for the same, not spe- cifically classified.	(a) 4.75% ad va- lorem (b) 4.50% ad va- lorem

General Notes

I. The provisions of this supplemental Schedule are subject to the pertinent Notes appearing at the end of Part II of Schedule IX (Geneva—1947 as amended).

II. Subject to the provisions of the Eighth Protocol of Supplementary Concessions to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, to the pertinent provisions of the said General Agreement, and to the pertinent provisions of Cuba's internal legislation, the rate specified in the rate-column in this supplemental Schedule will become effective as follows: Rates preceded by letter (a) will become initially effective on the date the concessions on the product or products concerned enter into force pursuant to the provisions of the said Eighth Protocol of Supplementary Concessions; and rates preceded by letter (b) will become initially effective in each case upon the expiration of a full period of one year after the related rates preceded by letter (a) become initially effective.

¹ Gonzalo Guell y Morales de los Rios.

SCHEDULE XX—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
This Schedule is authentic only in the English language
CUSTOMS TERRITORY OF THE UNITED STATES

PART I
MOST-FAVORED-NATION TARIFF
(See general notes at the end of this Schedule)

Tariff Act of 1930, paragraph	Description of Products	Rates of Duty	
		A	B
601	Wrapper tobacco, and filler tobacco when mixed or packed with more than 35 per centum of wrapper tobacco:		
	Unstemmed	95.45¢ per lb	90.9¢ per lb.
	Stemmed	\$1.634 per lb	\$1.548 per lb.
601	Filler tobacco not specially provided for (except cigarette leaf tobacco):		
	Unstemmed	16.8¢ per lb	16.1¢ per lb.
	Stemmed	24¢ per lb	23¢ per lb.
603	Scrap tobacco	16.8¢ per lb	16.1¢ per lb.

PART II
PREFERENTIAL TARIFF APPLICABLE TO PRODUCTS OF CUBA
(See general notes at the end of this Schedule)

Tariff Act of 1930, paragraph	Description of Products	Rates of Duty	
		A	B
601	Wrapper tobacco, and filler tobacco when mixed or packed together with more than 35 per centum of wrapper tobacco, if unstemmed.	86.45¢ per lb	81.9¢ per lb.
601	Filler tobacco not specially provided for (except cigarette leaf tobacco):		
	Unstemmed	13.3¢ per lb	12.6¢ per lb.
	Stemmed	19¢ per lb	18¢ per lb.
603	Scrap tobacco	13.3¢ per lb	12.6¢ per lb.

General Notes

1. The provisions of this supplemental schedule are subject to the pertinent notes appearing at the end of Schedule XX (Geneva, 1947), as authenticated on October 30, 1947.

2. Subject to the provisions of the Eighth Protocol of Supplementary Concessions to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (Cuba and United States of America), to the pertinent provisions of the said General Agreement, and to the provisions of section 350 (a) (3) (C) of the Tariff Act of 1930, the rates specified in the rate-columns in this supplemental schedule will become effective as follows:

(a) Rates in column A will become initially effective on June 29, 1957; and rates in column B will become initially effective in each case upon the expiration of a full period of one year after the related rates in column A became initially effective.

(b) For the purposes of subparagraph (a) above, the phrase "full period of one year" means a period or periods aggregating one year, exclusive of the time, after a rate becomes initially effective, when, by reason of legislation of the United States or action thereunder, a higher rate of duty is being applied.

3. Except as provided in note 4, in the case of any difference between the treatment prescribed for a product described in this supplemental schedule and the treatment prescribed for the same products in any prior Schedule XX to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the treatment prescribed in this supplemental schedule shall represent the prevailing obligation of the United States for the purposes of Article II of the said General Agreement.

4. If the concession provided for in Part II of this supplemental schedule, in respect of any product described in both Part I and Part II hereof, is withdrawn, the rate provided for such product in Part I of this supplemental schedule will thereupon cease to apply or will be suspended for such time as such withdrawal is effective. If the concession provided for in Part II of this supplemental schedule in respect of any such product is modified, the rate provided for such product in Part I of this supplemental schedule will thereupon be increased by the same amount as the rate provided for in Part II of this supplemental schedule is increased and for the same period, subject to any obligations then existing by reason of the inclusion of such product in Part I of any other Schedule XX.

WHITE HOUSE ANNOUNCEMENT, JUNE 28

The President has issued a proclamation giving effect to the United States tobacco concessions negotiated with Cuba under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and embodied in a trade agreement signed at Habana on June 20, 1957.

That agreement provides for United States tariff concessions to Cuba on five types of cigar tobacco in return for tariff concessions by Cuba to the United States on tinplate and tinned sheets, artificial colors, and motors. Existing rates of duties on these products are to be reduced by 10 percent over two annual stages. In both countries the first-stage reduction of 5 percent becomes effective on June 29, 1957, and the second stage will, under ordinary circumstances, become effective 1 year later.

Four of these five types of Cuban tobacco enjoy preferential rates which are lower than the rates applicable to similar tobaccos imported from other countries. In order to avoid a widening of the Cuban margin of preference on the four types of tobacco or a creation of a Cuban margin of preference on the fifth type, the proclamation also provides for an equivalent reduction in the rates applicable to such tobaccos from other countries entitled to trade agreement benefits.

The United States tariff concessions are expected to benefit domestic cigar manufacturers, whose imports of these tobaccos last year were valued at \$25.6 million. United States exporters are expected to benefit from the Cuban concessions.

PROCLAMATION 3190¹

CARRYING OUT THE EIGHTH PROTOCOL OF SUPPLEMENTARY CONCESSIONS TO THE GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

1. WHEREAS, pursuant to the authority vested in him by the Constitution and the statutes, including section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as then amended (48 Stat. (pt. 1) 943, ch. 474, 57 Stat. (pt. 1) 125, ch. 118, 59 Stat. (pt. 1) 410, ch. 269), the President on October 30, 1947, entered into a trade agreement with certain foreign countries, which trade agreement consists of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (hereinafter referred to as "the General Agreement"), including a schedule of United States concessions (hereinafter referred to as

"Schedule XX (Geneva—1947)"), and the Protocol of Provisional Application of the General Agreement, together with a Final Act (61 Stat. (pts. 5 and 6) A7, A11, and A2051);

2. WHEREAS by Proclamation No. 2761A of December 16, 1947 (61 Stat. (pt. 2) 1103), the President proclaimed such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions of the United States of America and such continuance of existing customs or excise treatment of articles imported into the United States of America as were then found to be required or appropriate to carry out the said trade agreement specified in the first recital of this proclamation on and after January 1, 1948, which proclamation has been supplemented by the other proclamations listed in the third recital of Proclamation No. 3140 of June 13, 1956 (3 CFR, 1956 Supp., p. 24), by the said proclamation of June 13, 1956, by Proclamation No. 3143 of June 25, 1956 (3 CFR, 1956 Supp., p. 33), by Proclamation No. 3146 of June 29, 1956 (3 CFR, 1956 Supp., p. 35), by Proclamation No. 3160 of September 28, 1956 (3 CFR, 1956 Supp., p. 44), and by Proclamation No. 3184² of May 16, 1957 (22 F. R. 3531);

3. WHEREAS I have found as a fact that certain existing duties and other import restrictions of the United States of America and of the Republic of Cuba, both being contracting parties to the General Agreement, are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States of America and that the purposes declared in section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as now amended (48 Stat. (pt. 1) 943, ch. 474, 57 Stat. (pt. 1) 125, ch. 118, 59 Stat. (pt. 1) 410, ch. 269, 63 Stat. (pt. 1) 698, ch. 585, 69 Stat. 162, ch. 169), will be promoted by the negotiation between these two Governments of a trade agreement supplementing the General Agreement;

4. WHEREAS, pursuant to section 3 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 72, ch. 141), I transmitted to the United States Tariff Commission for investigation and report a list of all articles imported into the United States of America to be considered for possible modification of duties and other import restrictions, imposition of additional import restrictions, or continuance of existing customs or excise treatment in the trade agreement negotiations with the Government of the Republic of Cuba referred to in the third recital of this proclamation, and the Tariff Commission made an investigation in accordance with section 3 of the said Trade Agreements Extension Act and thereafter reported to me its determinations made pursuant to the said section within the time period specified therein;

5. WHEREAS reasonable public notice of the intention to conduct trade agreement negotiations with the Republic of Cuba was given,³ the views presented by persons interested in such negotiations were received and considered, and information and advice with respect to such negotiations was sought and obtained from the Departments of State, Agriculture, Commerce, and Defense, and from other sources;

6. WHEREAS, the period for the exercise of the authority of the President to enter into foreign trade

² 22 Fed. Reg. 4705.

³ See p. 154.

⁴ BULLETIN of Oct. 22, 1956, p. 646.

agreements under the said section 350, as now amended, having been extended by section 2 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 162, ch. 160) from June 12, 1955, until the close of June 30, 1958, on June 20, 1957, as a result of the findings set forth in the third recital of this proclamation, I entered, through my duly authorized representative, into a trade agreement providing for the application of the relevant provisions of the General Agreement to additional schedules of tariff concessions relating to the United States of America and to the Republic of Cuba, which trade agreement consists of the Eighth Protocol of Supplementary Concessions to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, dated June 20, 1957, including a schedule of United States concessions (hereinafter referred to as "Schedule XX (Havana—1957)"), which trade agreement is authentic in the English and French languages as indicated therein, and a copy of which is annexed to this proclamation;

7. WHEREAS the supplementary trade agreement specified in the sixth recital of this proclamation provides that the schedule annexed thereto relating to a negotiating contracting party shall be regarded as a schedule to the General Agreement relating to that contracting party on the thirtieth day following the day on which the protocol shall have been signed by such contracting party or on June 29, 1957, whichever is the earlier, and such protocol was not signed on behalf of the United States prior to May 30, 1957;

8. WHEREAS I find that each modification of existing duties or other import restrictions of the United States of America and each continuance of existing customs or excise treatment of articles imported into the United States of America which is proclaimed in Part I of this proclamation will be required or appropriate, on and after the dates specified in the said Part I, to carry out the trade agreement specified in the sixth recital of this proclamation;

9. WHEREAS, pursuant to the authority vested in him by the Constitution and the statutes, including the said section 350, as then amended, the President on October 30, 1947, entered into an exclusive trade agreement with the Government of the Republic of Cuba (61 Stat. (pt. 4) 3699), which exclusive trade agreement includes certain portions of other documents made a part thereof and provides for the treatment in respect of ordinary customs duties of products of the Republic of Cuba imported into the United States of America;

10. WHEREAS by Proclamation No. 2764 of January 1, 1948 (62 Stat. (pt. 2) 1465), the President proclaimed such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions of the United States of America and such continuance of existing customs or excise treatment of articles imported into the United States of America as were then found to be required or appropriate to carry out the said exclusive trade agreement specified in the ninth recital of this proclamation on and after January 1, 1948, which proclamation has been supplemented by the other proclamations listed in the thirteenth recital of the said proclamation of June 13, 1956, by the said proclamation of June 13, 1956, and by the said proclamation of May 16, 1957;

11. WHEREAS Part II of Schedule XX (Geneva—1947), which was made a part of the exclusive trade agreement specified in the ninth recital of this proclamation, is supplemented by Part II of Schedule XX (Havana—1957), and I find that it is required or appropriate, on and after the dates specified in the said Part II, to carry out the said exclusive trade agreement that the said Part II of Schedule XX (Geneva—1947) be applied as supplemented by the said Part II of Schedule XX (Havana—1957);

12. WHEREAS by the said proclamation of June 13, 1956, the President proclaimed such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions of the United States and such continuance of existing customs or excise treatment of articles imported into the United States as were then found to be required or appropriate to carry out the Sixth Protocol of Supplementary Concessions to the General Agreement (TIAS 3591), including a schedule of United States concessions (hereinafter referred to as "Schedule XX (Geneva—1956)");

13. WHEREAS the third sub-classification of the description in item 1513 [second] in Part I of Schedule XX (Geneva—1956) erroneously reads "Figures or images of animate objects not specified above in this item" in place of "Figures or images of animate objects wholly or in chief value of metal and not specified above in this item"; and

14. WHEREAS in the said proclamation of May 16, 1957, the rate of duty in the item set forth in the eighth recital should be 67½¢ per 100 lb." in place of the rate of "67½¢ per lb." the reference in Part II should be to the "sixteenth recital" of the said proclamation of June 13, 1956, in place of the reference to the "thirteenth recital" of that proclamation,⁵ and the reference in Part III should be to the "sixteenth recital" of Proclamation No. 3105 of July 22, 1955 (69 Stat. C44) in place of the reference to the "thirteenth recital" of that proclamation;⁵

NOW, THEREFORE, I, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, President of the United States of America, acting under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes, including the said section 350, as now amended, do proclaim as follows:

Part I

To the end that the trade agreement specified in the sixth recital of this proclamation may be carried out:

(a) Such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions of the United States of America and such continuance of existing customs or excise treatment of articles imported into the United States as are specified or provided for in paragraphs 1 to 4, inclusive, of the said Protocol of Supplementary Concessions specified therein, and in Part I of Schedule XX (Havana—1957), shall, subject to the provisions of subdivision (b) of this part, be effective as follows:

(1) The rates of duty specified in column A at the right of the respective descriptions of products in Part I of Schedule XX (Havana—1957), on and after June 29, 1957.

⁵ See p. 157.

(2) The rates of duty specified in column B at the right of the said respective descriptions of products, on and after the appropriate date or dates determined in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 of the General Notes at the end of Schedule XX (Havana—1957).

(b) The application of the provisions of subdivision (a) of this part and of subdivision (a) of Part II of this proclamation shall be subject (1) to the applicable terms, conditions, and qualifications set forth in paragraphs 1 to 4, inclusive, of the said Protocol of Supplementary Concessions, in Schedule XX (Havana—1957), including the General Notes thereto, in Parts I, II, and III of the General Agreement, including any applicable amendments and rectifications thereof, and in the Protocol of Provisional Application specified in the first recital of this proclamation, and (2) to the exception that no rate of duty shall be applied to a particular article by virtue of this proclamation if, when the article is entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, more favorable customs treatment is prescribed for the article by any of the following then in effect:

(i) A proclamation pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, but the application of such more favorable treatment shall be subject to the qualifications set forth in paragraph 3 of the General Notes in Schedule XX (Havana—1957),

(ii) Any other proclamation, a statute, or an executive order, which proclamation, statute, or order either provides for an exemption from duty or import tax or became effective subsequent to June 20, 1957.

Part II

To the end that the exclusive trade agreement with the Republic of Cuba specified in the ninth recital of this proclamation may be carried out, such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions of the United States of America in respect of products of the Republic of Cuba and such continuance of existing customs or excise treatment of products of the Republic of Cuba imported into the United States as are specified or provided for in paragraphs 1 to 4, inclusive, of the Protocol of Supplementary Concessions specified in the sixth recital of this proclamation, and in Part II of Schedule XX (Havana—1957), shall, subject to the provisions of subdivision (b) of Part I of this proclamation and of the said exclusive trade agreement be effective as follows:

(1) The rates of duty specified in column A at the right of the respective descriptions of products in Part II of Schedule XX (Havana—1957), on and after June 29, 1957,

(2) The rates of duty specified in column B at the right of the said respective descriptions of products, on and after the appropriate date or dates determined in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 of the General Notes at the end of Schedule XX (Havana—1957).

Part III

The said proclamation of June 13, 1956, shall be applied as though the third sub-classification of the description in item 1513 [second] in Part I of Schedule XX (Geneva—1956) read "Figures or images of animate objects wholly or in chief value of metal and not specified above in this item".

Part IV

The said proclamation of May 16, 1957, is rectified by the insertion (a) in the item set forth in the eighth recital of the rate of "67½¢ per 100 lb." in place of the rate of "67½¢ per lb."; (b) in Part II of a reference to the "sixteenth recital" of the said proclamation of June 13, 1956, in place of the reference to the "thirteenth recital" of the proclamation,* and (c) in Part III of a reference to the "sixteenth recital" of the said proclamation of July 22, 1955, in place of the reference to the "thirteenth recital" of that proclamation.*

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

DONE at the City of Washington this twenty-eighth day of June in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and fifty-seven, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-first.



By the President:

JOHN FOSTER DULLES
Secretary of State

* See p. 157.

International Cooperation in Reporting Weather Observations From the High Seas

SECOND SESSION OF COMMISSION FOR MARITIME METEOROLOGY OF WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION, HAMBURG, GERMANY, OCTOBER 16-31, 1956

by W. F. McDonald

During the half century of its existence, the Commission for Maritime Meteorology under the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and its predecessor, the International Meteorological Organization, has promoted cooperation among ships of all nations in furnishing weather observations from the high seas. The vast expanse of the oceans makes the collection of ships' weather reports essential to fill the gaps between continental weather observation networks, not only for the daily weather forecasts and warnings of meteorological services which are important aids to sea and air navigation but also for climatological and research purposes as well.

The session of the Commission for Maritime Meteorology held at Hamburg, Germany, October 16-31, 1956, was the second meeting convened under the World Meteorological Organization, which was established in 1951. Representatives from 29 of the 49 member countries attended. Six international organizations, namely, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the International

Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, the International Hydrographic Bureau, the Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses, and the British Chamber of Shipping, sent observers. Three members of the WMO Secretary-General's staff also assisted at the session.

The United States was represented by W. F. McDonald, United States Weather Bureau, who served as chairman of the delegation; Capt. P. R. Drouilhet, United States Navy Aerology Branch; N. A. Lieurance and A. E. Sik, United States Weather Bureau; and J. J. Schule, United States Navy Hydrographic Office.

Comdr. C. E. N. Frankcom (U.K.), President of the Commission, presided at all meetings. He was ably assisted by the Vice President, Vice Adm. J. W. Termijtelen (Netherlands). To cope with the extensive agenda, three Working Committees were established. All organizational and operational subjects were studied by a group headed by J. A. van Duijnen-Montijn (Netherlands), while a second committee that dealt with technical questions was chaired by W. F. McDonald (U.S.A.). A third group considered agenda items relating to sea ice and was led by Helge Thomsen (Denmark).

As of July 1, 1956, the number of "selected," "supplementary," and "auxiliary" reporting ships of all nations approximated 2,800. With the International Geophysical Year (IGY) program scheduled to commence officially on July 1, 1957, the commission made an effort to strengthen the network of observations over oceans, especially in

• *W. F. McDonald, author of the above article, is a consultant to the U.S. Weather Bureau and a former assistant chief for administration. He was chairman of the U.S. delegation to the second session of the Commission for Maritime Meteorology.*

ocean areas of the Southern Hemisphere between latitudes 35°S. and 55°S., from which few reports from ships are being received. The conference not only urged members to establish and equip additional selected and supplementary ships as practicable, but also to recruit additional auxiliary ships wherever possible to record and furnish weather messages in an abbreviated code when they traverse ocean areas where reports are now scarce.

For the guidance of members in arranging with additional auxiliary ships to furnish reports during the IGY, the conference drew up a set of principles to be followed relative to the recruiting of such vessels, the checking and calibration of ships' barometers, thermometers, and other instruments, and codes for transmission of messages, and also provided an up-to-date chart indicating ocean areas where reports are scarce. The conference recommended that the guidance material be incorporated in an IGY brochure to be issued by the WMO.

On the subject of codes for ships' weather reports, there was general agreement that no major changes are at present needed in any ship code forms. In this connection, however, the conference noted a number of cases where instructions to ships' officers relative to the reporting and coding of waves, dew-point temperatures, and wind speeds, to mention a few, need amplification and reiteration in order to improve the accuracy and completeness of reporting these data within the provisions of existing codes. Revised instructions as needed were drafted at the session and recommended for incorporation in the WMO technical manual entitled "Meteorological Instruments and Observing Practices," chapter 10. This is the section which deals solely with the subject of marine observations.

The Commission also devised and recommended for adoption a system of universal codes for reporting marine ice by aircraft, ships, and land stations. As a guide to ice observing and reporting practices, the conference agreed to compile a photographically illustrated International Ice Nomenclature for publication. At the session a total of 76 ice photos were selected for use with the adopted nomenclature, and each was annotated in four languages, English, French, Russian, and Spanish. The task of completing this illustrated nomenclature was assigned to a small working group.

Many members reported that they had in operation experimental programs for developing shipboard meteorological instruments and observational techniques with a view to improving the accuracy of data recorded at sea on air and seawater temperatures, rainfall, waves, and other subjects. The conference urged meteorological services to furnish to the WMO Secretary-General reports of data collected and analyzed in such developments for distribution to other members engaged in comparable studies.

The conference noted with much interest the progress made by the United States in developing a program of upper-air observations aboard its merchant ships. As the session opened, five United States vessels in the North Atlantic and four in North Pacific waters were making and reporting by radio upper-air observations as they were under way at sea. Because of the paucity of such data from ocean areas, the conference recommended that meteorological services generally undertake to develop similar programs aboard their merchant ships.

An important technical paper on "The Problems of Cargo Ventilation" was also approved by the conference, after 4 years of preparatory work. This study was made by a working group headed by W. F. McDonald (U.S.A.). It involved considerable experimentation aboard ships under way at sea to determine the best methods to be employed in the ventilation of ships' holds for preventing damage to cargo. Comments and suggestions on first and second draft papers had, previous to the conference, been obtained from the maritime industry in many countries as well as from experts in the field of maritime meteorology. The consensus of many comments received from the marine industry showed that the Commission had made a valuable contribution to the application of the science of meteorology in protecting cargo on shipboard. The conference decided that this study should be recommended for publication by the WMO as a Technical Note, in their series under that title.

Much attention was also given by the conference to the need for expanding weather services to high-seas fishing fleets. For one thing, the monthly-month averages of climatological and hydrographical factors are found to be highly important for planning fishing operations in new ocean areas. While a number of meteorological services are now providing specialized weather forecasting

services to fishing fleets and also compiling marine climatological atlases needed by fishery organizations, there was unanimous agreement on the importance of establishing closer coordination of these programs between the WMO and international fishery organizations. To accomplish this objective, the conference decided to establish a working group to study this problem and recommend special measures of assistance. A representative of the Food and Agriculture Organization was invited by the Maritime Commission to serve on this group.

While the session was in progress, a seminar on the general subject of "Meteorology as Applied to Sea Navigation" was held. Those participating in presenting papers were Comdr. C. E. N. Frankcom (U.K.), N. A. Lieurance and J. J. Schule (U.S.A.), and T. Bergeron (Sweden).

Commander Frankcom discussed the problems of "Application of Meteorology to Sea Navigation" while Mr. Lieurance and Mr. Schule talked on the subjects of "Operational Weather for the Mariner" and "Least Time Tracks for Ships." Professor Bergeron's paper was entitled "Special Cloud Observations Aboard Merchant Ships."

At the Commission's final meeting, Helge Thomsen (Denmark) and K. T. McLeod (Canada) were elected unanimously as President and Vice President, respectively, for the 4-year term which will end at the close of the next CMM conference. Commander Frankcom, the retiring Commission President, after announcing elections of the new President and Vice President, was the recipient of grateful thanks from many members who spoke of his untiring efforts and able leadership during his two terms of office. The conference then proceeded to establish working groups to deal with problems arising until the third session, as follows: (a) Organizational and Operational Matters of the Selected Ship Plan, (b) Technical Problems Relating to Observations Aboard Ship, (c) Marine Climatology, (d) Marine Cloud Album, and (e) Sea Ice.

The foregoing is a summary of the major accomplishments of the session held in Hamburg, Germany. All decisions of the conference were embodied in 6 resolutions and 33 recommendations. The recommendations, however, will require approval by the WMO Executive Committee before coming into force. Also included in the recommendations were a number of other deci-

sions made at the conference relative to changes in WMO technical regulations, weather charts for use on shipboard, awards to cooperating ships, marine climatology, and other details relating to the selected-ship program.

Evaluation of Report on World Social Situation

Statement by Althea K. Hottel¹

Five years ago, when the *Preliminary Report on the World Social Situation* was before the Social Commission, my Government, along with others, recognized that study as one of the most important documents presented to the Commission up to that time. Since then we have progressed in many areas. Understanding of the processes of economics and social development is broader and deeper, and awareness of problems sharper and more specific. There has been more experience with programs such as community development; more attempts are being made to integrate economics and social planning. Through the United Nations and its specialized agencies, technical assistance has been given through governments to many of the peoples of the world. This assistance has meant improved health and education, increased agricultural and industrial output, expanded social-welfare services, and more trained young men and women to carry forward the plans and programs into the future. I am proud of the fact that my country has had an opportunity to contribute directly to this great effort.

In setting up a schedule of periodic reports on the world social situation, the General Assembly in effect has recognized the recurring need of an overall review and assessment of where our separate and combined efforts have brought us. In our united efforts how far have we moved toward the goals of individual and social welfare? What are the major obstacles that have held back progress? Where should our efforts be concentrated in the next few years?

It would be quite unrealistic to expect any sur-

¹ Made before the Social Commission of the U.N. Economic and Social Council on May 13 (U.S./U.N. press release 2672). Dr. Hottel is U.S. Representative on the Commission.

vey to answer all of these questions for us. Some involve value judgments on which there is not and perhaps never should be complete agreement. Others call for much more knowledge than is yet available. Information on social conditions must be analyzed carefully. And the areas of the world where progress and change are most rapid and most critical are also the areas for which information is most lacking.

In evaluating this *Report on the World Social Situation*,² it is important to see it in the context of the general program of the Social Commission and of the United Nations as a whole. This 5-year review of developments has some immediate suggestions for us. It presents information and analyses that should be useful as background data for social and economic planning by individual countries and by the United Nations and its specialized agencies. We should recognize, however, that successive reports will have a cumulative value as they can draw on more data, a longer time for observations of trends, and better developed categories of analysis. I want to suggest later some steps that might be taken to assure that the potential values of successive reports are realized.

Major Conclusions of Report

First, however, I would like to comment on a few of the major conclusions this report suggests. There are gratifying overall improvements in such important aspects of welfare as health, food consumption, and education; and great variations in the extent of progress in different parts of the world are evident. With the growing awareness of peoples throughout the world of improvements that could become possible in their situations, the gap between what is and what is desired may even be greater than ever before. Indeed, because more information is available for countries with higher standards of living than for underdeveloped countries, the report probably gives an overoptimistic picture of what is. This would seem to be true, for instance, with respect to health conditions. The report appears to underestimate the continuing massive dimensions of the problem of major communicable diseases, particularly malaria.

Certain communicable diseases, either in epi-

demic or endemic form, continue to be a serious health problem in many countries, particularly the less developed ones. The supply of medical personnel and hospital beds in relation to the population is still grossly insufficient in numerous of the latter countries, with a continuing maldistribution as between rural and urban areas. Statistical data on the state of health, important causes of death, health facilities, etc., unfortunately are still lacking for many of the backward regions. The fight against cancer and heart disease, which dominate the medical picture in developed countries, has not yet produced striking results in mortality reduction.

In the health field, as in others, the evidence of progress achieved gives hope for the future but no justification for any relaxation of programs now under way. In some less developed countries population growth has outrun increases in the production of food and thereby prevented attainment of prewar levels of per capita food production. Indeed, the story of population growth makes it clear that the need for improved and expanded health, education, and welfare services is increasing in magnitude and importance. Moreover, employment opportunities must be continuously expanded to keep pace with the growth in population of working age.

In a number of countries problems of chronic malnutrition are not yet solved. There is little indication that some of the fundamental long-term problems of world food and agriculture have come appreciably nearer to solution. Patterns of food production, while less unbalanced than earlier, still remain too rigid.

While the report notes that a significantly greater proportion of the world's children of school age are now attending school and that literacy is in general advancing up through the age groups, the rate of progress has been uneven in different countries, with one-half of the world's children still not in school. Popular demands for education and needs for specialized personnel have increased faster than school capacity, and the shortage of trained teachers as well as of classroom space continues.

It is a matter of regret to my Government that this report contains so little information relating to social security and social services. We recognize the problems which faced the Secretariat in assembling current information on this and other

² U.N. doc. E/CN.5/324 and Add. 1.

aspects of living conditions. The report as a whole shows evidence of considerable skill and ingenuity in the use of fragments of information to arrive at what would seem to be reasonably valid general estimates or conclusions. We recognize also that social-security program developments—national and international—are more appropriately discussed in the *International Survey of Programmes of Social Development*. It seems to us important, however, that the effect of such programs on levels of living should be considered along with the other components of levels of living covered in the *Report on the World Social Situation*. We would urge that special attention be given to this question in connection with the preparation of the third report. The increasing number of technical assistance programs relating to welfare services should begin to provide some of the information that would be needed.

This *Report on the World Social Situation* again brings out the intertwined relations of economic and social factors in the life and development of any community or nation. It thus supports the emphasis which the Social Commission and the Economic and Social Council have placed on coordinated planning and suggests that further attention should be given to the problem of balanced economic and social development. I shall refer to this matter again when we take up the Secretary-General's work program in the social field. The report also supports the coordinated approach to economic and social policy described in the expert report on *Maintenance of Family Levels of Living*.

Problems Ahead

If part I of this *Report on the World Social Situation* gives an idea of the general directions in which the world has moved in the search for better conditions of human life, part II throws a vivid light on problems ahead. For some time the Social Commission and other organs of the United Nations have been aware of the increasing movements of population from rural to urban communities in countries in various stages of economic development. We have known also that there are many social problems associated with such movements. The very great value of part II of this report is the focus which it gives to the many different aspects of the problem of urbanization. The clear distinction that is drawn be-

tween urbanization and industrialization is helpful. The report brings out the multiple causes that are responsible for people moving to cities. It shows to what an extent such movement may represent an escape from rural poverty rather than any realizable hope of a better level of living in the urban area. There is full recognition in the report of the profound social and cultural change that may be involved in the shift from rural to urban life and of the consequent dislocation of family life and older patterns of security.

Several conclusions emerge from the analysis of the social problems of urbanization as presented in the report. One is the importance of continued attention to the problems of rural as well as urban populations in societies undergoing rapid urbanization. Improvement of living conditions in rural areas may ease some of the pressure for movement to cities. Increased agricultural output and the development of small-scale industries can help provide a base for industrialization and expanding productivity. Technical training through community development or other programs may help those who do move to achieve a higher economic status in the city. It is clear that with the growth of towns and cities the tempo of cultural diffusion, both technological and ideological, is increased. We may need to give more attention to the ways in which rural peoples react and adjust to the influence of urban ways of life as known through relatives and friends who have made the shift.

Whatever is done in rural communities, migration will continue to pose major problems that can only be solved in the cities. The information and analysis given to us in this report point clearly to the need for a major expansion of all types of social services in the urban centers of most countries of the world. The problems of organizing adequate health services, adequate education services, sufficient housing, and practicable social security programs are compounded many times in communities that are undergoing rapid growth and change. This is true in my own country; the problem is obviously much greater in underdeveloped countries. Truly heroic efforts will be required in many countries to expand the basic social services rapidly enough to meet even the minimum needs of those who are migrating to the cities.

What types of service should be set up to help

newcomers and those persons who are living in mushrooming shanty towns on the edges of so many big cities is a question that deserves the attention of the Commission. An adequate development of the basic community services might best meet the needs of these groups rather than special services. On the other hand, if lack of funds and trained personnel prevents the expansion of such services rapidly enough, some other expedient may be called for to help ease the problems of transition and adjustment.

We strongly endorse the proposal made by the Secretary-General that the second *International Survey of Programmes of Social Development* give special attention to measures affecting peoples undergoing rapid transition through urbanization. I think the Social Commission should give support, also, to the proposed U.N.-UNESCO seminars on urbanization and encourage the Secretary-General to work with the specialized agencies and with nongovernmental organizations as appropriate in keeping attention focused on the social problems of urbanization and the importance of concerted study and action in this field.

Improving Usefulness of Future Reports

Mr. Chairman, I indicated earlier the great importance which we attach to having a periodic review of changes in the world social situation. I think it is desirable that the Social Commission give some attention to steps that might be taken to improve the usefulness of future reports.

One of the major difficulties that we all recognize is the lack of adequate statistical and other information for many areas of the world. Continued encouragement and assistance should be given to individual countries to develop and to make available the basic information needed for study and measurement of social conditions and social change. In many countries a necessary preliminary step is the training of more statisticians and social scientists. It seems to me important for the Social Commission to add its voice to those of the Statistical Commission and the Population Commission in urging attention to these needs in the technical assistance program of the United Nations, with the special note that social data should be given appropriate emphasis in the overall statistical programs.

The specific suggestions made by the Secretary-

General in document E/CN.5/L.212 for improvement of information on social conditions should in our judgment be supported by the Commission. The suggestion that the Secretariat in cooperation with UNESCO establish contact with research centers in underdeveloped areas and assist in building up local social research institutes opens up the prospect of useful and highly significant advances. We believe the Secretary-General should be encouraged to further develop this plan and start to carry it forward as rapidly as possible. The other part of the program outlined in the Secretary-General's paper is somewhat vague. We certainly agree there is need for definition of the types of information required for guiding social policy and a formulation of methods of obtaining such information. The first report on *International Definition and Measurement of Standards and Levels of Living* made a very important contribution to the development of common understanding in this field. We would support need for further work in this area. The method by which this can be accomplished needs to be clarified, however. I shall refer to this point a little later.

In any event we would recommend the Secretary-General should be requested to present to the next meeting of the Social Commission a preliminary analysis of the major gaps in the information needed for a meaningful evaluation of the world social situation and suggestions as to specific steps that might be taken to remedy them, including possible referral of defined questions or areas of inquiry to expert groups. This report could be closely related to the progress report on *International Definition and Measurement of Standards and Levels of Living* that will also be presented to the 12th session of the Commission. This suggested report on major gaps should also serve to amplify the suggestions in the Secretary-General's paper on improvement of information on social conditions.

Further attention should be given also to the possibility of sample surveys of family living conditions. Such analyses are needed to supplement the aggregate data and national averages derived from periodic censuses of agency reports. Limited sample surveys may also fill in gaps in knowledge during the long period that may be required to develop the basic statistical system of a country.

In view of the rapidity of social change that is evident throughout the world and the increasing need to relate specific problems and programs to an understanding of the major trends of development, we are convinced that the *Report on the World Social Situation* should have a higher priority in terms of staff time devoted to its preparation than has been possible in the past. We think also that a special effort should be made to broaden the coverage of the third report and to establish a framework for successive reports.

Question of Postponing Third Report

We have noted with interest the suggestion made by the representative of the Secretary-General that the third *Report on the World Social Situation* be postponed until the 14th session of the Social Commission in 1963. This proposal has certain advantages which the Commission will wish to consider seriously. The change proposed would make possible the utilization in the third report of at least preliminary data from the 1960 *World Census of Population*. As you know, some 80 countries are now planning to take censuses of population in or around the year 1960, collecting information on at least a basic list of items and in many cases much more. The individual countries will publish and use their own data. It is planned also to include comparative tables from these censuses in the *Demographic Yearbook*. The *Report on the World Social Situation* should be one of the most important documents in which analytic use is made of the material for comparative purposes. Sufficient data from the census would not be available in time for a 1961 report; it would be unfortunate to delay such use of the data until 1965. With careful planning it should be possible to make effective use of basic information from most of the census in a report for the 1963 session of the Commission. While the world population census will not provide more than a fraction of the information needed for a study of social conditions, it will for the first time in the history of the world make available so much basic data for the majority of the world's population that it will inevitably serve as a benchmark for future studies.

Postponement of the third *Report on the World Social Situation* until 1963 would almost necessarily involve a postponement of the third *Inter-*

national Survey of Programmes of Social Development until 1965, and we would so recommend. It would not seem either necessary or wise, however, to take any decision at this time as to what the regular time interval for these two reports should be thereafter.

If the third *Report on the World Social Situation* is postponed until 1963, the intervening time should be used to lay a basis for improvements in this and successive reports. The support for individual countries attempting to improve their statistical knowledge and the report on major gaps would contribute to this improvement.

We would also propose that the Secretary-General be requested to undertake a review of the general scope, organization and analytical framework, and the major types of data that should be included in successive reports on the world social situation. It seems desirable that certain indices be presented regularly to assure some continuity and basis for study of long-term trends. On the other hand, the major problems that need to be emphasized to give a valid picture of social conditions will change over time. Perhaps the report should combine a section of statistical tables accompanied by brief interpretive comments and a section presenting an integrated analysis of world social conditions from a special point of view. Such ideas as we have at this time are highly tentative. The subject is worth careful consideration. Before final decisions are made, there will need to be some consultation with the interested specialized agencies and careful consideration of the staff resources needed to carry out any program adopted. It might be very useful, also, to have the advice of consultants or an expert group with special competence in social research.

We would suggest that the Secretary-General submit a report and his recommendations as to the future scope of the *Report on the World Social Situation* to the 13th session of the Social Commission in 1961. Since the Commission would not have before it either a world report or an international survey at that session, it could give some time to a consideration of this special report. The Secretary-General should also be invited to make preliminary comments on this subject to the 12th session of the Commission and to include in his work program for 1960-61 provision for

such special study or expert consultations as he thinks desirable.

Finally, let me say again that I am persuaded the *Report on the World Social Situation* can be one of the important instruments we have for keeping attention focused on the social aspects and the social objectives of economic development. We appreciate the difficulty of the task which is involved in this kind of overall review. The Secretary-General and his staff are to be commended for the carrying out of this task and in particular for the excellence of the second part of the report, dealing with the social problems of urbanization. The report should be made widely available to all who are concerned with economic and social development and with progress toward improved conditions of life for people everywhere.

1958 World Health Assembly To Be Held at Minneapolis

Press release 409 dated July 5.

The Department of State announced on July 5 that the Director General of the World Health Organization at Geneva has accepted the proposal that the 11th World Health Assembly be held at Minneapolis, Minn., in late May and early June of 1958.

The invitation of the U.S. Government to the World Health Organization to convene its 11th Assembly in the United States was extended by the Department of State to the 10th World Health Assembly meeting at Geneva, Switzerland, in May of this year.¹ The invitation, extended pursuant to the authorization contained in Public Law 832, 84th Congress, was accepted unanimously by the 10th Assembly. The date and site of the meeting in the United States were left for subsequent determination.

The World Health Organization, with permanent headquarters at Geneva, Switzerland, is an association of 88 member countries engaged in promoting international cooperation in the field of health. It is one of the 11 specialized agencies of the United Nations.

The World Health Assembly is the supreme governing body of the World Health Organization. It meets annually to determine the policies of the World Health Organization and, in 1958,

¹ BULLETIN of May 20, 1957, p. 823.

will celebrate the 10th anniversary of the founding of that body. The United States has been an active member of the World Health Organization since its inception.

U.S. Delegations to International Conferences

International Conference on Public Education

The Department of State announced on July 3 (press release 407) that the U.S. Government will be represented by the following delegation at the 20th International Conference on Public Education, sponsored jointly by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the International Bureau of Education (IBE), to be held at Geneva, Switzerland, July 8-17, 1957:

Finis E. Engleman, *chairman*, Executive Secretary, American Association of School Administrators, National Education Association

Ray L. Hamon, Chief, School Housing Section, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Francis Keppel, Dean, Faculty of Education, Harvard University

John W. McLeod, McLeod and Ferrara, Architects, Washington, D. C.

Fredrika M. Tandler, Specialist in International Educational Relations, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

The subjects for discussion at the 1957 conference, as approved by the joint committee of UNESCO and IBE, include (1) the expansion of school building, (2) the training of primary-teacher training staffs, and (3) reports on the progress of education during the school year 1956-57 presented by the Ministries of Education.

The 19th International Conference on Public Education was attended in 1956 by 74 countries.

Current U. N. Documents: A Selected Bibliography

Economic and Social Council

Commission on Human Rights. Advisory Services in the Field of Human Rights. E/CN.4/736, February 8, 1957. 5 pp. mimeo.

Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. Report of the Food and Agriculture Organization. E/CN.11/445, February 11, 1957. 30 pp. mimeo.

Commission on the Status of Women. Nationality of Married Women. Memorandum by the Secretary-General. E/CN.6/254/Add.3, February 12, 1957. 4 pp. mimeo.

Commission on the Status of Women. Occupational Outlook for Women. E/CN.6/302, February 12, 1957. 15 pp. mimeo.

Population Commission. Preliminary Report on Possibilities for International Co-operation in the Study of Internal Migration. E/CN.9/141, February 12, 1957. 32 pp. mimeo.

Commission on the Status of Women. Tax Legislation Affecting Married Women Who Work. E/CN.6/297, February 15, 1957. 40 pp. mimeo.

Commission on the Status of Women. Opportunities for Women in Handicrafts and Cottage Industries. Second Progress Report prepared by the International Labor Office for the Commission on the Status of Women. E/CN.6/303, February 19, 1957. 59 pp. mimeo.

Commission on the Status of Women. Access of Women to the Teaching Profession. Preliminary Report prepared by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. E/CN.6/301, February 15, 1957. 14 pp. mimeo.

TREATY INFORMATION

United States and Pakistan Sign Income-Tax Convention

Press release 400 dated July 1

Secretary Dulles, in behalf of the United States, and Ambassador Mohammed Ali and Finance Minister Syed Amjad Ali of Pakistan, in behalf of Pakistan, on July 1 signed a convention between the United States and Pakistan relating to double taxation of income.

The convention follows in general the pattern of conventions now in force between the United States and numerous other countries for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on income. It is designed to eliminate obstacles to the international flow of trade and investment. It contains provisions relating to business, investment, and personal-service income, official salaries, pensions and annuities, remuneration of teachers, remittances to students and apprentices, and interest received by the State Bank of Pakistan and the Federal Reserve Banks of the United States. It also contains, as is customary, provisions regarding administrative procedures, including exchange of information, for giving effect to the convention.

The convention contains certain provisions, unlike those in income-tax conventions with other countries, under which the United States would take an important step toward avoiding nullification of the efforts of a foreign country to encourage industrial development through its tax laws. Under the income-tax law of Pakistan a business qualifying as a new enterprise may obtain tax exemption for a 5-year period on profits up to 5 percent of invested capital, and dividends paid from such profits may be tax exempt. At present an American corporation qualifying for such treatment under Pakistan law may find that U.S. taxes will be increased and thus offset the effects of the Pakistan tax law. Under the proposed convention this situation would be remedied within limits and on certain conditions by treating as though paid for foreign-tax-credit purposes the amount of income tax and supertax by which the American taxpayer's Pakistan tax is reduced.

The convention applies, so far as United States taxes are concerned, to the Federal income taxes, including surtaxes. It does not apply to the imposition or collection of taxes by the several States, the District of Columbia, or the Territories or Possessions of the United States, although it contains a broad national-treatment provision similar to a provision customarily found in treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation. In Pakistan the convention would be applicable to the income tax, supertax, and business-profits tax.

The convention would be brought into force by the exchange of instruments of ratification and would be effective in the United States for taxable years beginning on or after January 1 of the year in which such exchange takes place. It would be effective in Pakistan for "previous years" or "chargeable accounting periods," as defined in Pakistan law, beginning on or after January 1 of the year in which the exchange takes place.

Surplus Agricultural Commodity Agreement With the Philippines

Press release 389 dated June 25

The Governments of the United States and of the Philippines, represented by Minister Horace Smith and Acting Secretary of Foreign Affairs Raul Manglapus, respectively, signed an agree-

ment on June 25, 1957, under which the U.S. Government undertakes to finance \$10.3 million worth of U.S. agricultural commodities under the provisions of title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act as amended (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.). These commodities will be sold for pesos.

The commodities included in the agreement are rice, \$2.5 million; cotton, \$4.9 million; dairy products, \$1.125 million; meat products, \$500,000; inedible tallow, \$500,000; and dried beans, \$50,000. The balance is for that part of the ocean transportation which will be financed by the U.S. Government.

The peso proceeds resulting from these sales will be divided as follows: a loan to the Government of the Philippines for economic development, the peso equivalent of \$5.2 million; a grant to the Government of the Philippines for use by the armed forces of the Philippines in the common defense, the peso equivalent of \$2.1 million; to help develop new markets for U.S. agricultural commodities, for international educational exchange, and for other expenditures of the U.S. Government in the Philippines, the peso equivalent of \$3 million.

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Automotive Traffic

Convention concerning customs facilities for touring. Done at New York June 4, 1954.¹

Ratification deposited: Sweden, June 11, 1957.

Customs convention on temporary importation of private road vehicles. Done at New York June 4, 1954.¹

Ratification deposited: Sweden, June 11, 1957.

Copyright

Universal copyright convention. Done at Geneva September 6, 1952. Entered into force September 16, 1955. TIAS 3324.

Ratification deposited: United Kingdom, June 27, 1957.

Protocol 1 concerning application of the convention to the works of stateless persons and refugees. Done at Geneva September 6, 1952. Entered into force September 16, 1955. TIAS 3324.

Ratification deposited: United Kingdom, June 27, 1957.

Protocol 2 concerning application of the convention to the works of certain international organizations. Done at Geneva September 6, 1952. Entered into force September 16, 1955. TIAS 3324.

Ratification deposited: United Kingdom, June 27, 1957.

Protocol 3 concerning the effective date of instruments of ratification or acceptance of or accession to the convention. Done at Geneva September 6, 1952. Entered into force August 19, 1954. TIAS 3324.

Ratification deposited: United Kingdom, June 27, 1957.

War

Geneva convention relative to treatment of prisoners of war;

Geneva convention for amelioration of condition of wounded and sick in armed forces in the field;

Geneva convention for amelioration of condition of wounded, sick and shipwrecked members of armed forces at sea;

Geneva convention relative to protection of civilian persons in time of war.

Dated at Geneva August 12, 1949. Entered into force October 21, 1950; for the United States February 2, 1956. TIAS 3364, 3362, 3363, and 3365, respectively. *Ratification deposited:* Albania, May 27, 1957.²

Whaling

Protocol amending the international whaling convention of 1946 (TIAS 1849). Done at Washington November 19, 1956.¹

Ratification deposited: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, July 3, 1957.

BILATERAL

Austria

Agreement regarding certain bonds of Austrian issue denominated in dollars, and protocol. Signed at Washington November 21, 1956.¹

Senate advice and consent to ratification given: July 2, 1957.

France

Agreement amending the power reactor agreement of June 19, 1956 (TIAS 3689), concerning civil uses of atomic energy. Signed at Washington July 3, 1957. Enters into force on date on which each Government receives from the other written notification that it has complied with statutory and constitutional requirements.

Germany

Research reactor agreement on behalf of Berlin concerning civil uses of atomic energy. Signed at Washington June 28, 1957. Enters into force on date on which each Government receives from the other written notification that it has complied with statutory and constitutional requirements.

Power reactor agreement concerning civil uses of atomic energy. Signed at Washington July 3, 1957. Enters into force on date on which each Government receives from the other written notification that it has complied with statutory and constitutional requirements.

Italy

Power reactor agreement concerning civil uses of atomic energy. Signed at Washington July 3, 1957. Enters into force on date on which each Government receives from the other written notification that it has complied with statutory and constitutional requirements.

Netherlands

Agreement amending the power reactor agreement of June 22, 1956,¹ concerning civil uses of atomic energy. Signed at Washington July 3, 1957. Enters into force on date on which each Government receives from the other written notification that it has complied with statutory and constitutional requirements.

Pakistan

Convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income. Signed at Washington July 1, 1957. Enters into force upon exchange of instruments of ratification.

¹ Not in force.

² With reservations made at time of signature.

DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Designations

R. Gordon Arneson as Deputy Special Assistant, Intelligence, effective June 30.

John M. Steeves as Political Adviser to the Commander-in-Chief, Pacific, effective July 1. (For biographic details, see press release 401 dated July 1.)

Norbert L. Anschuetz as Special Assistant to the Deputy Under Secretary for Political Affairs, effective July 2.

Opening of Consulate at Kirkuk, Iraq

Effective June 18, 1957, a consulate was established at Kirkuk, Iraq. Lee Dinsmore is the principal officer at the post.

PUBLICATIONS

Foreign Relations Volume

Press release 397 dated June 28

The Department of State on July 6 released *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1940, Volume II, General and Europe*. This is the second of five volumes for 1940 to be published, volume IV on the Far East having been previously released.

The first 342 pages of this volume, under the heading "General," contain correspondence on subjects of multilateral interest, chiefly regarding problems connected with the neutrality policy of the United States, repatriation of American citizens and others, assistance to refugees, and efforts of the United States to acquire supplies of raw materials for defense purposes. Among minor topics treated is that of territorial claims in the Antarctic advanced by certain governments. The "General" section in this volume is a continuation from volume I, which will include correspondence on many phases of the European war.

The remainder of volume II deals with bilateral

relations with the following countries: Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Rumania, Spain, and Switzerland.

The largest of the country sections, 287 pages, is that regarding relations with France, with interest centering on the effects of the German occupation of that country and the resulting concern for American security, especially as to the disposition of the French fleet and the fate of French overseas possessions. Other problems affecting American security arose with respect to possessions of Denmark and the Netherlands after occupation by Germany.

Correspondence under other country headings concerns such matters as the defense of Iceland, efforts to keep Italy out of the war, proposed sending of relief supplies to Poland, Spanish neutrality, and the supplying of foodstuffs to Spain. As to Germany, only minor issues are treated under this country heading, the broader aspects of the war being covered elsewhere in this volume and in volume I.

Copies of volume II (v, 915 pp.) may be obtained from the Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., for \$4 each.

Recent Releases

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

The Austrian State Treaty—An Account of the Postwar Negotiations Together with the Text of the Treaty and Related Documents. Pub. 6437. European and British Commonwealth Series 49. 99 pp. 35¢.

A publication recounting the postwar negotiations by which Austria regained her full sovereignty after 17 years of foreign occupation. A documentary annex includes the texts of the treaty, various related documents, and several statements made by President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles concerning the significance of this treaty.

The Seal of the United States. Pub. 6455. Department and Foreign Service Series 64. 14 pp. 30¢.

A publication giving the history, design, and use of the great seal. The illustrated pamphlet contains a full-color reproduction of the seal, approximately 5 inches in diameter, suitable for framing.

Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands—1956. Pub. 6457. International Organization and Conference Series III, 120. 208 pp. 75¢.

The ninth annual report by the United States to the United Nations on the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Agriculture. Surplus Agricultural Commodity Agreement With the Philippines	172
Algeria. Secretary Dulles' News Conference of July 2	139
Asia. Working Group To Consider Asian Regional Nuclear Center	149
Atomic Energy	
Atoms-for-Peace Agreement With Germany for City of Berlin	149
Availability of Additional Quantities of Uranium 235 (Eisenhower, Strauss)	146
Nuclear Power Agreements Signed With France, Germany, and Italy (Herter, Strauss)	147
Working Group To Consider Asian Regional Nuclear Center	149
China, Communist. Secretary Dulles' News Conference of July 2	139
Communism. Secretary Dulles' News Conference of July 2	139
Congress, The. Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy	152
Cuba. Supplemental Trade Agreement With Cuba (texts of agreement and proclamation)	157
Department and Foreign Service	
Designations (Ansuetz, Arneson, Steeves)	174
Opening of Consulate at Kirkuk, Iraq	174
Disarmament. Secretary Dulles' News Conference of July 2	139
Economic Affairs	
Administration of Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act (text of Executive order)	150
First Balance-of-Payments Consultations Under GATT	153
Revision of Tariff Quotas on Potatoes (text of proclamation)	154
Supplemental Trade Agreement With Cuba (texts of agreement and proclamation)	157
United States and Pakistan Sign Income-Tax Convention	172
Educational Exchange. Administration of Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act (text of Executive order)	150
Europe. Foreign Relations Volume	174
France. Nuclear Power Agreements Signed With France, Germany, and Italy (Herter, Strauss)	147
Germany, Federal Republic of	
Atoms-for-Peace Agreement With Germany for City of Berlin	149
Nuclear Power Agreements Signed With France, Germany, and Italy (Herter, Strauss)	147
Health, Education, and Welfare. Evaluation of Report on World Social Situation (Hottel)	166
International Information	
Administration of Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act (text of Executive order)	150
Beginning of the International Geophysical Year (Eisenhower)	145
International Organizations and Conferences	
International Conference on Public Education (delegation)	171
International Cooperation in Reporting Weather Observations From the High Seas (McDonald)	164
1958 World Health Assembly To Be Held at Minneapolis	171
Iraq. Opening of Consulate at Kirkuk, Iraq	174
Italy. Nuclear Power Agreements Signed With France, Germany, and Italy (Herter, Strauss)	147
Jordan	
Aid to Jordan	146
Secretary Dulles' News Conference of July 2	139
Korea. Secretary Dulles' News Conference of July 2	139
Mutual Security. Aid to Jordan	146
North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Durability of the Atlantic Community (Herter)	135
Pakistan. United States and Pakistan Sign Income-Tax Convention	172
Philippines. Surplus Agricultural Commodity Agreement With the Philippines	172

Presidential Documents	
Administration of Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act	150
Availability of Additional Quantities of Uranium 235	146
Beginning of the International Geophysical Year	145
Revision of Tariff Quotas on Potatoes	154
Supplemental Trade Agreement With Cuba	157
Publications	
Foreign Relations Volume	174
Recent Releases	174
Science	
Beginning of the International Geophysical Year (Eisenhower)	145
International Cooperation in Reporting Weather Observations From the High Seas (McDonald)	164
Treaty Information	
Atoms-for-Peace Agreement With Germany for City of Berlin	149
Current Actions	173
Supplemental Trade Agreement With Cuba (texts of agreement and proclamation)	157
Surplus Agricultural Commodity Agreement With the Philippines	172
United States and Pakistan Sign Income-Tax Convention	172
United Nations	
Current U.N. Documents	171
Evaluation of Report on World Social Situation (Hottel)	166
International Cooperation in Reporting Weather Observations From the High Seas (McDonald)	164
Name Index	
Ansuetz, Norbert L.	174
Arneson, R. Gordon	174
Dinsmore, Lee	174
Dulles, Secretary	139
Eisenhower, President	145, 146, 151, 154
Herter, Christian A.	135, 148
Hottel, Althea K.	166
McDonald, W. F.	164
Steeves, John M.	174
Strauss, Lewis M.	147, 148

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: July 1-7

Releases may be obtained from the News Division, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C.

Press releases issued prior to July 1 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 376 of June 20, 389 of June 25, 395 of June 27, 396, 397, and 398 of June 28, and 399 of June 29.

No.	Date	Subject
400	7/1	Income tax convention with Pakistan.
*401	7/1	Steeves designated political adviser to CINCPAC (biographic details).
402	7/1	Economic aid to Jordan.
403	7/1	GATT balance-of-payments consultations.
*404	7/1	Educational exchange.
405	7/2	Dulles: news conference.
†406	7/2	Wilcox: "Foreign Policy and Some Implications for Education."
407	7/3	Delegation to International Conference on Public Education (rewrite).
408	7/3	Nuclear power agreements with France, Germany, and Italy.
409	7/5	World Health Assembly to meet in U. S. in 1958.
†410	7/5	Visit of Pakistan Prime Minister.

* Not printed.

† Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.



the
Department
of
State

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed And:

\$
(cash, check, or
money order).

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300
(GPO)

Foreign Relations of the United States

*The basic source of information on
U.S. diplomatic history*

1940, Volume II, General and Europe

This volume contains correspondence on subjects of multilateral interest chiefly regarding problems connected with the neutrality policy of the United States, repatriation of American citizens and others, assistance to refugees, and efforts of the United States to acquire supplies of raw materials for defense purposes. Among minor topics treated is that of territorial claims in the Antarctic advanced by certain governments.

The volume also deals with bilateral relations with the following countries: Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Rumania, Spain, and Switzerland.

The largest of the country sections is that regarding relations with France, with interest centering on the effects of the German occupation of that country and the resulting concern for American security, especially as to the disposition of the French fleet and the fate of French overseas possessions.

Correspondence under other country headings concerns such matters as the defense of Iceland, efforts to keep Italy out of the war, proposed sending of relief supplies to Poland, Spanish neutrality, and the supplying of foodstuffs to Spain.

Copies of this publication may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., for \$4 each.

Please send me copies of *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1940, Volume II, General and Europe.*

Name:

Street Address:

City, Zone, and State:

VOID